The
Church of England Pulpit,

AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
283.05
CHUO
v.24

THE

Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

◆

JULY TO DECEMBER, 1887.

VOL. XXIV.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160, FLEET STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXIV.

Sermons on :— PAGE

A Prospect for the Next Fifty Years—By Very Rev. J. C. Vaughan, D.D. ... 1
Loving Loyalty Before Aught Else—By Rev. John Napleton ... 4
The Christian Ministry—By Rev. J. Ll. Roberts, M.A. ... 13
The Victorian Age—By Rev. Phillip T. Bainbrigge, M.A. ... 16
Enthusiasm—By the Bishop of Derry ... 25
A Jubilee of Joy, Praise, and Charity—By Very Rev. J. C. Vaughan, D.D. ... 26
The Moral Appeal of the Church—By Rev. Walter Lock, M.A. ... 37
Ordination—By Rev. J. B. Keene, M.A. ... 49
Queen Victoria's Jubilee — By Rev. C. B. Brigstocke, M.A. ... 53
The New Covenant—By Rev. Canon Philip Dwyer, M.A. ... 61
Loyalty—By Rev. G. Jannings, M.A. ... 66
The Body an Evidence of Christianity—By Bishop of Meath ... 73
Jesus Christ Crucified—By Rev. Henry L. Paget, M.A. ... 77
The Blasphemy Against the Holy Ghost—By Rev. Augustus W. Gurney, M.A. ... 85
Knowing Christ—By Rev. James Hamilton, B.A. 90
Retrospection—By Bishop of Chester ... 97
Light Out of Darkness—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ... 100
The Truthfulness of God and the Many-sidedness of His Truth—By Rev. Walter B. Money, M.A.... 104
The First and Great Commandment—By Rev. Augustus W. Gurney ... 109
Christ the Bread of Life—By Rev. H. Heber Evans, B.A. ... 114
The Zenana Mission—By Rev. A. Stuart, M.A. ... 121
Love—By Rev. E. Martin Venn, B.A. ... 125
God's Faithfulness—Man's Ingratitude—By Rev. H. Harris Davies, M.A., Ph.D. ... 133
Conscience—Rev. John Lightfoot, M.A., D.Sc. ... 136
A Test of Christian Life—By Rev. H. Thompson, B.A. ... 139
The Time of Visitation—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ... 145
The Tradition of the Elders—By Rev. Augustus W. Gurney ... 157
Church Expansion—By Bishop of Durham... ... 169
The Pharisee and the Publican—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ... 181
The Freedom of the Will—By Rev. J. Lightfoot, M.A. ... 186
Micaiah—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. ... 193
The Value of Patient Work—By Rev. A. W. Seymour, M.A. ... 197
God's Banished—By Rev. Augustus W. Gurney ... 205
The Church of England Encouraged by the Example of Joshua—By Bishop of Carlisle ... 217
Rational Prayer—By Rev. Alfred Pearson, M.A. ... 220
The Hebrew Prophets—By Rev. Canon Driver, D.D. ... 229
Miracles—By Bishop of Meath ... 241
The Intermediate State—By Rev. Charles Richard Panter, M.A., LL.D. ... 246
The Marian Cultus—By Rev. Philip Dwyer, M.A. 253
Day by Day—By Rev. R. C. Nugent Kelly, M.A. 265
A Sermon for Advent—By Rev. H. Heber Evans, B.A. ... 267
The Central Africa Mission—By Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D.... ... 277
The Communion of Saints—By Rev. W. Walter Merry, D.D. ... 278
The Unjust Steward—By Ven. Archdeacon Bardsley 289
The Church and Dissent—By Rev. J. J. Sherrard, B.D. ... 291
Why the Lord Delayeth His Coming—By Rev. James Hamilton, B.A. ... 293
The Spiritual Transformation of the Body—By Very Rev. J. J. Stewart-Perowne, D.D. ... 301
The King Cometh Unto Thee—By Rev. J. Carr, LL.D. ... 305
The Celtic Missions of Iona and Lindisfarne—By Bishop of Durham ... 313
The Present Hopes of the Church—By Rev. A. Plummer, D.D. ... 316
Sarah, or Subjection in Marriage—By Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, M.A. ... 318

Sermons by :—

Bishop of Carlisle—The Church of England Encouraged by the Example of Joshua ... 217
Bishop of Chester—Retrospection ... 97
Bishop of Durham—Church Expansion ... 169
Bishop of Durham—The Celtic Missions of Iona and Lindisfarne ... 313
Bishop of Derry—Enthusiasm ... 25
Bishop of Meath—Miracles ... 241
Bishop of Meath—The Body an Evidence of Christianity ... 73
Bainbrigge, Rev. Philip T., M.A.—The Victorian Age... ... 16
Bardsley, Ven. Archdeacon—The Unjust Steward... 289
Brigstocke, Rev. C. B., M.A.—Queen Victoria's Jubilee ... 53
Carr, Rev. J. LL.D.—The King Cometh Unto Thee ... 305
Davies, Rev. H. Harris, M.A., Ph.D.—God's Faithfulness—Man's Ingratitude ... 133
Driver, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Hebrew Prophets 229

283.05
CHUO
V.24

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Dwyer, Rev. Canon Philip, M.A.—The New Covenant ... 61
Dwyer, Rev. Philip, M.A.—The Marian Cultus ... 253
Evans, Rev. H. Heber, B.A.—Christ the Bread of Life... ... 114
Evans, Rev. H. Heber, B.A.—A Sermon for Advent 267
Gurney, Rev. Augustus W., M.A.—The Blasphemy Against the Holy Ghost ... 85
Gurney, Rev. Augustus W.—The First and Great Commandment ... 109
Gurney, Rev. Augustus W.—The Tradition of the Elders ... 157
Gurney, Rev. Augustus W.—God's Banished ... 205
Hamilton, Rev. James, B.A.—Knowing Christ ... 90
Hamilton, Rev. James, B.A.—Why the Lord Delayeth His Coming ... 293
Jannings, Rev. G., M.A.—Loyalty ... 66
Keene, Rev. J. B., M.A.—Ordination ... 49
Kelly, Rev. R. C. Nugent, M.A.—Day by Day ... 265
Liddon, Rev. Canon—Light Out of Darkness ... 100
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Time of Visitation 145
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Pharisee and the Publican ... 181
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—Micaiah ... 193
Lightfoot, Rev, John, M.A., D.Sc.—Conscience ... 136
Lightfoot, Rev. J., M.A.—The Freedom of the Will 186
Lock, Rev. Walter, M.A.—The Moral Appeal of the Church ... 37
Merry, Rev. Walter W., D.D.—The Communion of Saints ... 278
Money, Rev. Walter, M.A.—The Truthfulness of God and the Many-sidedness of His Truth ... 104
Napleton, Rev. John—Loving Loyalty Before Aught Else ... 4
Paget, Rev. Henry L., M.A.—Jesus Christ Crucified 77
Panter, Rev. Charles Richard, M.A., LL.D.—The Intermediate State ... 246
Pearson, Rev. Alfred, M.A.—Rational Prayer ... 220
Plummer, Rev. Alfred, D.D.—The Central Africa Mission ... 277
Plummer, Rev. A., D.D.—The Present Hopes of the Church ... 316
Roberts, Rev. J. Ll., M.A.—The Christian Ministry 13
Sherrard, Rev. J. J., B.D.—The Church and Dissent 291
Seymour, Rev. A. W., M.A.—The Value of Patient Work ... 197
Stewart-Perowne, Rev. J. J., D.D.—The Spiritual Transformation of the Body ... 301
Stuart, Rev. A., M.A.—The Zenana Mission ... 121
Thompson, Rev. H., B.A.—A Test of Christian Life 139
Vaughan, Very Rev. J. C., D.D.—A Prospect for the Next Fifty Years ... 1
Vaughan, Very Rev. J. C., D.D.—A Jubilee of Joy, Praise, and Charity ... 26
Venn, Rev. E. Martyn, B.A.—Love ... 125
Wordsworth, Rev. Christopher, M.A.—Sarah, or Subjection in Marriage ... 318

LEADING ARTICLE :—

Parochial Isolation ... 8
Women as Teachers ... 19
Rural Nonconformity ... 29
Betting and Gambling... ... 43
Spiritual Provision in Workhouses ... 56
Parties and Principles ... 68
Federal Union 80
Dangers Ahead... ... 93
Clerical Training ... 106
The Body a Vehicle of Salvation ... 116
Artisan Atheism ... 129
The Latest Facts on Irish Matters ... 140
Parochial Unity ... 149
Fight for your Country—How? ... 164
The Bishop of Lichfield's Address ... 173

LEADING ARTICLE :— PAGE

Unchanged Rebellion ... 189
America and Stipulated Arbitration ... 199
Past and Present Elementary Schools ... 210
The "Down-Grade" ... 224
Preaching Orders ... 234
The Mental Differences between Men and Women 249
The Mind as Influenced by Sex ... 261
Law and Order... ... 269
Poor Little Wales ... 282
Elasticity of Worship ... 296
Causes of the Mental Differences in Men and Women 308
The Education of Women ... 322

PAPERS :—

Women as Educators—By Rev. Edward Thring, M.A. ... 19, 32
Two Portraits by a Home Ruler ... 30
The Messianic Prophecies.—An Evidence of Revelation—By Rev. Croasdaile E. Harris ... 44, 57
Trade Unions as Friendly Societies ... 69
In Memoriam—Mr. C. Jacomb ... 94
In Memoriam—Walter Davies Williams, M.D. ... 117
The Plymouth Brethren—By Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, B.D. ... 150, 165, 174
An Interview with Dr. Döllinger ... 190
Words of a Believer ... 200
Death of Rev. Edward Thring ... 211
The Tithe Question ... 212
Mohammedanism—Rev. Isaac Taylor, LL.D. ... 235
The Continuity of the English Church during the Medieval and Reformation Periods—By Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D. ... 270
The Latin Vulgate and its Versions—By Rev. T. B. Naylor, B D. ... 283
F. D. Maurice—By Rev. Henry Taylor, M.A. ... 297

CORRESPONDENCE :—

What is the Church ... 9
Sir W. Phillimore on Hymns, etc. ... 10
The Keys as Emblems of St. Peter ... 33, 47, 201
The Privy Council on the Bennett Case ... 70, 191
St. Paul the Author of the Acts of the Apostles ... 82
Extreme Unction ... 83
Steering Close to the Wind ... 94
Federal Union 95
Two Romish Glosses on John VI. ... 107, 130
The Church of Ireland's Catechism 118, 131, 142, 153, 167, 212, 225
The Minor Incumbents of the Church of Ireland 118, 143, 153
The Real Presence ... 119, 131, 152, 167, 178
Is Prevention Always Better than Cure? ... 142
The Late Rev. John Nash Griffin, D.D. ... 143
Mr. Gurney's Sermon 143
More Difficulties of a Literal Translation.—Letter III.... ... 143
Worship no Proof of God's Existence ... 153
The Duty of Parents and of the Clergyman... ... 179
The New Preface to the Irish Prayer Book... 179, 202, 213
Mr. Bennett—Presence Question ... 191
Clerical Seminaries ... 191
A Contrast ... 191
Eucharistic Adoration... ... 202
He Who Catechises Forms the Mind of Youth 202, 214
Proximus Ardet ... 226
What is Christianity? 237
Church Principles *versus* the Low and Broad Church Parties ... 238
Mohammedanism ... 250
If These Things be Done in the Green Tree, what will be Done in the Dry? ... 251
The Intermediate State ... 262, 298

988258

CORRESPONDENCE :—

PAGE
What is the Meaning of a Passage in the Bennett Judgment 263
A Question about the Presence 263, 274
The Marian *Cultus* 275
The Change in the Black Rubric Made in 1662—Its Meaning and Effect 285
The Continuity of the Church of England 286
The Welsh Church Disestablishment 299
Parties in the Irish Church 309
Reformed Burials 309
The Gold Discovery in Wales 309
Papal Infallibility 310
Parties in the Revision Synod 323
The Words of Administration—What do they Mean? 323

POETRY :—

The Consecration of the Parthenon (Joseph John Murphy) 10
First Sorrow (Joseph John Murphy)... 71
A Suggestion for a Painter (Joseph John Murphy)... 154
Lines to Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin 323

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

"*The Expositor*" 23, 71, 119, 179, 239, 287
"St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians"—By Rev. C. J. Ellicott, D.D. 23
"Church Teaching"—By Rev. A. Lush 47
"A Modest Inquiry as to Certain Difficulties Connected with the Mysterious Presence in the Holy Eucharist" 71
"Social Arrows"—By Lord Brabazon 83
"Elijah: His Life and Times"—By Rev. Professor W. Milligan, D.D... 203
"Lessons on the Works of our Lord and on the Claims of our Lord"—By F. S. Cook, D.D.... 214
"The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper"—By J. J. Stewart Perowne, D.D. 214
"The British and Foreign Evangelical Review" ... 215
"The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges"—By Rev. J. Rawson Lumby, D.D. 227
"Word Studies in the New Testament"—By Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, D.D. 275
"Bible Models"—By Rev. Richard Newton, D.D. 276
"Sermons Preached in Worcester Cathedral"—By Rev. Edward V. Hall, M.A. 276
"Solomon: His Life and Times"—By Ven. Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, D.D. 287
"The Christian Fulfilments and Uses of the Levitical Sin-Offering"—By Rev. Henry Batchelor... 287
"Bible Warnings"—By Rev. Richard Newton, D.D. 310
"De Incarnatione Verbi Dei"—Religious Tract Society 311
"Fingal and its Churches"—By Rev. Robert Walsh, M.A. 310

MISCELLANEOUS :—

PAGE
The late Rev. Harman Chaloner Ogle 7
Church Patronage Bill... 11
The Heart of Nicholas of Ely 12
Resignation of Incumbents' Amendment Bill ... 18
Burial Reform 34, 299
Home Reunion Society 35
The Oxford Theological Class List 36
Rev. Luke Rivington on Buddhism 42
The Bishop of Japan's Mission 48
Collection of Tithes 95, 321
The Bishop of Chichester 96
St. Anselm's Chapel, Canterbury 108
In Memoriam—Walter Davies Williams, M.D. ... 117
Inspection of Winchester Cathedral 120
A Surpliced Female Choir 154
Presentation of Throne to Lichfield Cathedral ... 155
Rev. F. E. Wigram on Missions 155
St. Helen's, Bishopsgate 156
The Vacant Lady Margaret Professorship 168, 192, 269
Admission of Women to Degrees at Cambridge ... 189
The Bishop of Bedford on Temperance 204
Ladies' Home Mission Society 210
The Church Society at Cambridge 215
Count Leo Tolstoi 216
A Cathedral for the Isle of Man 233
Welsh Methodism 239
The Universities' Missions to Central Africa ... 240
Wasted Millions and Sinecures 251
The Disney Professorship of Archæology 252
The Bishop of Worcester 261
Stoke Pogis 263
Election of Principal Ryle to the Hulsean Professorship 264
The Free and Open Church Society... 287
Bishop of St. Albans' Fund for the East End ... 288
Sunday Scholars and Feasts 295
The Choir of Exeter College, Oxford 307
The late Rev. Thomas Lowe 307
Mission Preachers for the Diocese of Ely 312
Bristol Bishopric Committee 324

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312, 324

CLERICAL OBITUARY 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312, 234

The Church of England Pulpit
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. XXIV.—No. 601. SATURDAY, JULY 2, 1887. PRICE TWOPENCE.

The Church of England Pulpit.

A PROSPECT FOR THE NEXT FIFTY YEARS.

By the Very Rev. J. C. VAUGHAN, D.D.,
Master of the Temple.

Sermon Preached at the Temple Church, on the Sunday after the Jubilee, June 26th, 1887.

"Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward."
—Exodus xiv. 15.

"THAT they go forward." That is the word of God for us to-day, as last Sunday it was "That they look backward."

Retrospect is one half of life, prospect is the other. There is no third thing. The present is but the copula of past and future—itself refuses to be contemplated—it is gone while we name it.

Retrospect is a duty. Gratitude demands it—humility demands it—truth demands it. But it is a peril as well as a duty. Gratitude soon becomes gratulation; humility is on the verge of despondency; truth itself may be paralysing. The disciples began to rejoice and praise God—and they did well—for all the mighty works that they had seen; but the Saviour was pressing on to His Passion and felt Himself straitened till it was accomplished.

We looked back last Sunday upon a half-century of blessing. We were compelled, in common honesty, to feel that the great cause had been on the move these fifty years; that vast opportunities had been given us, as a Church and as a nation, and that they had not all been flung away; that the good hand of our God had been upon us, and that progress had been made, though irregular and inadequate, during this chequered half-century, in those things which exalt a nation and build a Church.

Certainly the week which followed the Sunday was a week never to be forgotten. Splendour was there—splendour of spectacle, splendour of ceremonial, splendour of Royalty, splendour of loyalty. We saw, and praised God. The old words were verified once again, with due substitutions of phrase, name, and title—"They blessed the King, and went into their tents joyful and glad of heart for all the goodness that the Lord had done for David His servant and for Israel His people."

But did none of us feel a want, and a yearning, and a longing unsatisfied? Did none of us enter into that instinct of grace and nature which made the old patriarch, after a week of festivity—though his was a quiet and domestic festivity compared with ours—yet feel that there was room for a special sacrifice of expiation, because it might be that in such a week his sons had sinned and cursed God in their hearts? Strange, yet so true, that a week of feasting may not only make people careless and worldly, but also engender a spirit of murmuring and discontent towards Him Who gives so liberally and never upbraids.

Is there not, too, an unreality in all mirth—a contrast not least felt when least spoken of, between what we do and what we are, between the thing that we are enjoying and the thing that we have deserved?

Now therefore let us abruptly shift to-day our point of view, and turn from the half-century of mingled good and evil behind us to the half-century (if the world should last so long), which lies all in dim darkness in front of us. Into that coming half-century we plunge to-day "as men that have no eyes"—few of us shall emerge from it on this earth in the year 1937—only the comparatively young can so much as see the end of it—even they can scarcely keep another Royal Jubilee, scarcely another such as that we have been celebrating—and yet with the shaping and colouring of that next half-century all of us will have to do, who so much as enter upon it for a year or two, with or without any special advantages for making a mark or leaving an individual impress upon it.

It was right, we said, to insist upon seeing only the bright side, while the business was the keeping of a Jubilee upon which ill-omened words might cast a blighting shade. But now prospect, not retrospect, is the work in hand; and God seems to say to us, as He said to the man "faithful in all His house," "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward." And we naturally ask, In what direction and under what guidance? Is all movement progress? Is there not a false and fallacious progression, which might land us upon inhospitable shores, or bring us to the brink of some fatal precipice? Therefore our thought for to-day, in pondering the stirring charge of the text, must have for its keynote the word progress, but must recognise a right progress and a wrong, and seek to lay down a few landmarks, in different regions, by which we may choose good and refuse evil.

Our common language distinguishes between haste and speed. Vulgar phraseology marks a certain kind of character and a certain way of living as swift in pace, yet leading nowhither or to ruin. To go forward may be no praise. An empire may go forward, in the sense of restless ambition, unprincipled aggression, boundless annexation, and be only weakening its force, moral and material, at each step. A State may go forward, in perpetual change, headlong experiment, revolutionary reform, and part with everything characteristic, everything that made and was its constitution, till it ceases to be itself, and collapses in ridicule. A Church may go forward, in the sense of adding to its ritual, its service-book, or its doctrine, and find itself so far from forwarder at the end of it that it is again just where it was and what it was three centuries before—a thing of many colours, of countless additions and accretions, only to be purged away by a reformation which must this time be a revolution. Science may go forward, in the hands of its professors, theorising and dogmatising, boasting itself in an exclusive right to speak—though it has the key to but one part and province of the Universe—till it loses all its title to the respect and deference else so willingly paid to it. It is quite possible, St. John tells us (using the very word), for religion to go forward till it loses the very essentials of the Gospel—loses, as he expresses it, God as well as Christ, in the nemesis of a self-conceited and rebellious license of free thought.

All this shows that the command to go forward requires many qualifications if it is not to mislead. Let us glance at one or two of the lines of progress which may be anticipated in the future.

1. We can easily imagine that in many departments of Nature the discoveries of the next half-century may be prolific. If the progress of science is in the coming fifty years what it has been in the past—and it is far more likely to quicken than to slacken its speed—wonderful may be its results. But by the nature of the case these things cannot be foreseen. No one could have predicted telegraph or telephone—no one could have prophesied half a century ago the marvellous developments of steam or of electricity. Discovery outruns prophecy, and would falsify it if it dared to foretell. Whether discovery may spread itself in the next half-century into that utterly unexplored region which is the border-land between brain and thought, between animation and life, between matter and spirit, it is idle to conjecture. Whether indeed science will ever secure any footing at all in that shadowy region which is at present the hunting-ground of dreamers and visionaries, and out of which spiritualists have hitherto succeeded only in evoking "doleful creatures," profitless where not ridiculous to the living, it would be trifling to attempt to prophesy. Two things, two only, would we in this place lay down as matters of principle in the onward march of the science of the future. (1) One of these is that it be careful always to confess and mark the distinction, so easily obliterated, between the registering of facts and the framing of theories—the one, a work which is absolutely its own, and in which religion ought to join hands with reason in a ready and spontaneous acquiescence; the other, a thing for long trial, patient examination, equal discussion—a thing which no man is a bigot for not accepting or a fool for not seeing. (2) The other principle is the demarcation of provinces as between one class of workers and another; the division of labour amongst investigators of Nature and students of Revelation; the willingness, not more in the interests of religion than of common sense, to admit that neither telescope nor microscope, neither mathematics nor physics, have any application to a world beyond death, or to the communion of man with his Maker, or to the question whether indeed there is forgiveness of sins, and, if so, by what intervention or mediation altogether belonging to the depths and secrets of God; and thus, finally, the true reconciliation between the theologian and the philosopher, by definition of fields and implements of labour, each acknowledging, each recognising, each leaving room and space for each, sympathising in the toil, congratulating on the result, as seeing God alike in all, and assured of His being able, in His own good time, to supply the missing link between His two worlds and between His two kinds and classes of workmen.

"Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward" into the next half-century of labour in this spirit; and then in the grand Jubilee which shall close it Science and Faith shall at least meet and kiss each other.

2. It is not so difficult to anticipate the tasks proposed to us in the future in other fields—those of the social and moral welfare of our people. Of these things we can speak here, where politics must be silent. We cannot doubt that the admission of all the householders of England to an equal share in the

government of the country will have an enormous influence—if "that one thing which now letteth" can once be "taken out of the way"—upon the onward course of home legislation. Apart from possibilities which we will not entertain, of violent and revolutionary changes in Church and State, it is evident that the condition of the people, its health and wealth, its homes and its wages, its sanitation and its education, its free access to all that have hitherto been distinctions, its perpetual progress in all that makes the life of this world worth living, must be and ought to be the subject of subjects, to the disparagement of many topics which have heretofore too often claimed the first attention of governments and parliaments. What can compare in importance, in the foreview of the next half-century, with the direction of this certain, this critical, this indeed popular movement? How to level upwards, how to raise this class without degrading that, how to spread far and wide advantages which till now have been privileges, how to harmonise discords, how to turn selfish interests into common interests, how to give without taking, and to popularise without socialising—these will be the tasks and toils of the legislators of the opening twentieth century in England. "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward."

In this effort with all its stupendous, superhuman difficulties, one thing we will name as a proponderating duty. Whosoever says one word to set class against class—to aggravate and exasperate the feeling (always just below, if not above, the surface) of any injury done to these by the circumstances of those—circumstances for which the latter are in the very smallest degree, it may be responsible—whosoever hounds on the less advantageously circumstanced to count his own, before the law makes it so, that possession of another, which is the growth perhaps of ages, and now, if anything can be any one's, is that other's by right—that man is the cruellest enemy of the class or the race which he professes to befriend; that man is a traitor to the half-century of the future, as well as to the country of which he is helping to create the history. The duty of each man who puts his hand to the manipulation of this difficult coming time, is, first, midst, and last, to soften and sweeten and harmonise—in Scripture phrase, to sow his seed not with curses, but with blessings.

The half-century before us will have a yet more serious work to do in the moral than even in the social direction. Without presuming to strike the balance—of which no man is capable—between the moral condition of two centuries or two generations of Englishmen, at least we may say this, and no one will be hardy enough to gainsay it—that there is a lamentable laxity of opinion as to some forms of evil, and a fearful inferiority of practice even to opinion, in countless thousands not of the criminal, not even of the lower classes of our people in these latest decades of the century.

One gigantic vice has been made the object of a vigorous and not unsuccessful crusade. Intemperance has gone out of fashion in the last half-century. It has been assailed, where fashion could not reach it, by a wide-spread, and well-organised combination. That confederacy has often used language of exaggeration, has even seemed (like a new Koran) to promise an unconditional heaven to its followers. One might wish that it had been more modest in its promises and less furious in its denunciations. But great things are not effected by bated breath. We may be thankful for what has been done, though we could not quite thus have done it.

There is a sister vice—if vices were not essentially selfish and sisterless—one of which it is a shame even to speak, but which, while drunkenness slays its thousands, out of sight in its lurking dens is slaying its ten thousands. It may be doubted whether combination can deal effectually, or even decently, with such matters as this. The very publicity of confederacy is here dangerous. It is in homes, it is in consciences, it is in hearts that the work must be done if it can be done—blue ribands may be, white crosses scarcely can be, worn as badges.

Nevertheless, we have indicated what we think will be the battlefield of morality in the years that begin to-day. To awaken a sense of the beauty, of the dignity, nay, of the possibility of virtue, where there is so much against it, not only in the strength of temptation, but in the incredulity or the ridicule or the graver talk and argument of men, is an enterprise of tremendous difficulty; but if the moral bone and muscle of England is to be maintained it must be attempted: the thrilling remonstrance of St. Paul must be laid to heart if Christianity itself is to be more than a name fifty years hence—"Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God?—and ye are not your own, for ye were bought with a price—therefore glorify God in your body."

3. "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward."

We have touched upon two lines and directions of progress—our last word is kept for one yet more practical because more personal.

It may not be given to us to advance science or to affect opinion. But each one of us is charged with a life. Each one of us has to see that that life be not retrograde, not stationary, not oscillating, but a steady progress towards a definite end—that end itself a beginning, but with this difference—that, though advance be still and for ever the necessity of the being, all that here threatens or tempts or hinders will be shut and barred out of the presence-chamber in which spirits made perfect shall dwell with God, "That they go forward." Which of us, brethren, can honestly say that the law of his life is progress? Who is there that cannot recall a time when he was more earnest, more conscientious, more religious than now? Was there not once perhaps an influence upon us, parental, pastoral, friendly, now withdrawn or weakened—an influence which made us feel that the Spirit was at least dwelling with us, if not quite yet in us?

Oh, brethren! let us hasten to redeem the time. Let us no longer halt been two opinions, as to the aim of life, or as to the way.

"Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward." Is there upon us any influence at this moment holding us back? Or are we simply let and hindered by that negative yet most powerful of all influences—"the world too much with us"? Let this be a day of casting off and of putting on—casting off the old, putting on "the new man which after God is renewed." Here, in God's presence, let us register one solemn vow—that we will, whatever happens, walk with God all our days, and not miss Him in the end of them. "Not far from every one of us," for "in Him we live, and move, and have our being," let us "feel after Him till we find Him."

So, whether the days for us be few or many, we shall have done our part towards making the next half-century, for the land of our birth and of our devotion, a half-century of progress, if not in other ways, yet at least in that "righteousness which exalteth a nation"—in that "wisdom which cometh down from above, and which is first pure, then peaceable"—in that "love which passeth knowledge," greatest of gifts, because likest God.

◆

LOVING LOYALTY BEFORE AUGHT ELSE.

By the Rev. JOHN NAPLETON, Rector of Wymington, Bedfordshire.

Sermon Preached at the Parish Church, Stroud, Gloucestershire, on Sunday, June 19th, 1887.

"He called His twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases.

"And he sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick."—St. Luke, ix. 1—2.

ONE thought is uppermost in all our minds this week—one thought rises to the lips of every loyal British subject, and finds an echo in every heart: "It is the Jubilee!" Volumes have been written; the newspapers teem with approaching festivities and contemplated memorials, throughout the length and breadth of the land. A spark of loyalty has been kindled in nearly every breast, from our Sovereign Lady herself downwards; her first impulse on hearing of the offering to be presented to her by England's wives, mothers, and daughters, being to perpetuate the memory of her best beloved and most honoured one by a statue, the solidity of which, its material derived from quarries near to the "Granite City," should symbolise the firmness of her own loyalty to the husband of her youth and early womanhood. From the Queen on her throne down to the thousands of nameless, unknown orphans, or worse who, for the first time, perchance, in their lives, will be served with good and plentiful food in Hyde Park, a spark of loyalty has been kindled, and mark! Like all fires fanned by the breeze, it will spread. It is a strong wind, a powerful spirit that moves the Nation this week. The spirit of Loyalty is inherent in every Englishman, and only a base perversion of his nature will quell or estrange it. Therefore it is bound to spread far and wide. Like your beacon fire on Rodborough Hill, it will lengthen and widen as it burns, until all the country within range of that wide-spreading eminence shall see its wreathing and leaping tongues of flame.

Oh, how pitiful, how paltry is that querulous, fault-finding temperament which poisons the minds of a few here and there, who prove this rule by their own unhappy exception to it! who, for instance, that is bent upon securing Home Rule in Ireland, would think of dragging his pet topic into prominence this Jubilee week, instead of joining heart and soul with those who differ from him in creed and in party, but would fain be one with them in evincing their common fealty to their common Sovereign? Not one whose heart was in the right place! How ashamed of their want of discretion one feels when one hears Church people talking ironically of "Jubilee prisons for incarcerated priests!" All of us who know how the Privy Council decisions and secular courts misdirect and usurp the spiritual prerogative of the Church's rule are anxious to see them confined to their proper sphere; but who would be so narrow-minded, so graceless, as to ventilate the grievance on this occasion of national rejoicing? Only one here and there! It would be simply to imitate the disappointed child who, because he cannot get just what he wants on the instant, cries out: "Then I won't play any more!" Again, it is humiliating to think that some of the Church newspapers should earn the well-merited opprobrium of Nonconformists by running down the form of Thanksgiving and Prayer appointed by authority, because it savours to them of "Erastianism," and asks the nation's prayers for one whose religious sympathies are more in accord with the Scottish Kirk than the English Episcopal Organization. It has been clearly put thus in a recently published sermon: "We could well wish that our beloved Queen had in her childhood heard such great preachers as those who have adorned our Church's pulpits in her later days; but even under such religious light as then prevailed, the influence and example of the young Queen were enlisted for good and noble ends."

How much mischief is done by such instances as those just given of cynicism and detraction? The spirit they display is antagonistic to all love and loyalty to the Powers ordained by High God, and therefore provokes His wrath, and causes His displeasure to arise. They say the nation is going mad over the Jubilee! Be it so! If peace and goodwill and charity are signs of lunacy, because they are stirred by true patriotism, and in many cases also by a sincere respect for the nobler traits of character in that woman who has faults and failings like themselves, then may the nation well be proud of its insanity! This is the time, pre-eminently so, for bringing to the front *every* cause of thankfulness and rejoicing—in the Church, in the realm, in the family circle—the time to give to God His rightful tribute from the hearts which His numberless mercies have filled to overflowing during the last fifty years. If there be one cause for regret, it is the base ingratitude which we, His children, have shown to the all-loving Father. He has now put before us this unparalleled opportunity of showing forth His praise ourselves, and of prompting and instigating all who come within the scope of our influence to mention the loving kindness of the Lord, and declare the wonders that He doeth for the children of men. Those, therefore, who try to disaffect England's people, and turn the sweet into bitter by picking holes in every garment they touch, and tarring their neighbours with the same brush which has smeared and disfigured themselves, deserve either to be pitied and prayed for, or to be condemned and scouted. And here, whilst deprecating Politics as a theme for the Pulpit, and without discussing them, or expressing any opinion whatever thereon, we may fitly cite the nation's verdict on a point bearing upon the subject we have in hand. Without presuming to do more than quote *facts* as evidencing our assertion that the spirit of loyal allegiance to the throne of England is a vital and primary principle in many—ay, *most*—minds, we may well revert to the great *test of loyalty* furnished by our last General Election. Men of such totally different political opinions as Lord Salisbury and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain have been led to unite and co-operate. And how is this? Because the large majority of what are now known as "Unionists," conscientiously believed that the adoption of Home Rule in Ireland would prove to be the first step towards disintegrating the Empire, and subverting the throne. Whether that belief was well-founded it is not for us to say; but only to evidence it as proving that when once the spirit of loyalty was aroused, all other differences were placed in the background, and the question of Monarchy or Republic was deemed to be at stake. What changes this belief has effected among those at the nation's helm! From Chief Ministers of State to the most insignificant of the new recipients of the Franchise! In the county where I reside, the Member who had been easily returned by the Liberal interest for sixteen years was, for this reason alone, supplanted by a stranger. Again, in my own small parish, the only political Dissenter it contains, whose antipathy to the Church and her institutions had previously made Disestablishment and Disendowment an essential test-question at elections, even he gave up the yellow and donned the red, white, and blue because he believed honestly and sincerely that the stability of the throne was endangered. And in the former of these cases, in order to show that his action in the Irish Question was not dictated by disaffection to the throne, our late Member has given £200 towards the Jubilee fund of his own parish, and £5 towards our own, of which he is a landlord, besides, I believe, other donations for the like object elsewhere. My own parishioner also has worked heartily with me on our Jubilee Committee for the feast which we expect to celebrate to-morrow, and has pledged himself not to oppose the wish of the parishioners if it be decided to erect a new church clock, or a fence round the church-yard, though he personally objects "on principle" to both of these objects, regarding them as "Sectarian." He, too, headed a deputation to request me to return home in time for our Jubilee feast to-morrow, and though sorely in need of change and rest, I have arranged to travel from eleven o'clock to-night until half-past eight to-morrow morning that I may give full proof of my loyalty by working after my return from noon till dusk to facilitate the general enjoyment as much as I can. I mention these details because they are public and relevant, and serve to strengthen my assertion touching the national spirit of loyalty, and, as far as regards my own share in them, to prove to you, my present hearers, that I take a lively interest in the Stroud Hospital, for which I am here to plead to-night, and have not hesitated to suffer personal inconvenience that I may speak on its behalf. In saying this I do not desire to take to myself credit which is not deserved; all I wish to enforce is that it is a labour of loving loyalty on which I am now engaged. Your local hospital is bound up in my memory with some now gone to their rest, who always showed a tender solicitude for its welfare, and helped it on as far as they could.

Love is the fulfilling of the law. Love brought the Great Healer into our world so marred by sin and suffering. Love for our Queen, as God's anointed servant, should be paramount in our breasts when we think of her standing beside the sick-bed of some forlorn waif in our London hospitals, or flashing her messages of sympathy and condolence to the suffering and the bereaved all over our land! Love and loyalty go hand-in-hand as mother and child, and a heaven-born pair they truly make! There is nothing that draws forth human love, that tends to raise the spirit from the earthly to the heavenly parent so much as the office of the Healer, exercised physically in our hospitals, spiritually in the message of the Son of Consolation. All men have sinned, and the wages of sin is death; but we know that our Great Healer has taken the sting out of death, and we must thank God, Who has given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath been made sin for us, that He might bear our griefs and carry our sorrows, calling unto Himself the weary and heavy laden that He might give them rest. Nor does the power of His healing extend no farther, as some suppose, than to the *soul*. Truly, the days of miracles have outwardly, at least, come to an end; but His Word cannot fail; His promise can never be broken; and He who spoke first by the mouth of His herald prophet that joyful message of the Feast of Jubilee: "To preach recovering of sight to the blind," and afterwards confirmed it by the gracious words that proceeded out of His mouth. *He*, too, said, and emphasized it by solemn repetition: "Heal the sick." This is a command to all time, quite as much as to the Apostles themselves. Not, indeed, to the special and miraculous, but to the general and natural modes of healing are we to look, and labour for its fulfilment. If it were a part of the Jubilee proclamation under the law that the blind were to recover their sight, it is quite as much a part of *our* proclamation under the Gospel: "Heal the sick!" Do all you can to mitigate suffering, and to enable the patient to endure what is laid upon him. This is the drift of our text, my brethren, at all times, and at none more pointedly so than in a year of Jubilee. We can none of us escape the pressure of some disease, earlier or later in life, any more than we can escape the icy hand of death at its close. Oh, then, if we are loyal, not only to our Queen, but to the God by whom kings reign, let us not try to escape the fellowship of *His* sufferings Who is our Head. When one of the members suffer, then all the members suffer with it, if they be truly parts of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones. Nay! let us do our utmost to remove the pain that causes so much anguish both to the sin-stricken soul, and to the poor tortured body. How can we best do this? is the thought now more especially before us. The answer is a fourfold one: Give of your time, your talent, your money, your prayers, either or all, as the Lord may have prospered you. Your *money* is asked for to-night. Let me urge you to give as though it were for your own bodily infirmities—and then you will give liberally—to others as unto yourself.

Long years ago, soon after the new buildings were opened, a humble inhabitant of this neighbourhood said to me: "Every time I go to the Stroud Hospital, Sir, I wish for gold enough to give every sufferer in Stroud the benefit of proper medical treatment." Some little time afterwards I met two dear friends of my own coming towards the town. On the brow of the elder one corroding care and bitter sorrow had set their baneful brand, while around the other—a young wife in early womanhood—the Angel of Death was even then hovering. They bore a basketful of primroses, gathered on the verdant slopes so near at hand, and they informed me that they were taking them to the hospital. It was previous to the death of that eminent statesman with whose name the little wayside flower has now been for so long associated; but they alluded to a recent act or speech of his defending the cause of *loyalty*, and said they had brought them as a trophy of their own allegiance to our Constitutional Sovereign, to comfort the stricken inmates. May not even the smallest country child do *something* towards healing the sick by bringing a look of peace and thankfulness to the fevered countenance of some worn sufferer, as every flower, trained or wild, gathered by each little child, is set beside their couch of pain? Flower services have, I believe, a great work to do, and children should be taught the meaning of those hallowed words:—

Here, Lord, we offer thee all that is fairest,
  Bloom from the garden, and flowers from the field,
Gifts for thy stricken ones, knowing Thou carest
  More for the love than the wealth that we yield,

and encouraged to

Gather the flowers together,
  And place them near the shrine,
In the midst of the golden glory,
  And the radiance all divine.

But there is yet a further lesson which Flower Services can teach. It is, alas! a frequent progression from the hospital to the church-yard, and I have this year begun to teach my own Sunday school children a lesson in connection with this. We cannot always send flowers to the sick, but I encourage the children to bring them. After school they go to church flowers in hand, and singing a hymn. After the Litany has been said and another hymn sung, the flowers are presented at the altar, and then we go in procession round the churchyard, each child having received back again its flowers, and falling out of the ranks at the particular grave on which it desires to lay its offering. Thus the children are taught, *first*, that "placing them near the shrine" consecrates them to a holy use; secondly, that, through the Communion of Saints, the living have an unsevered connection with the faithful departed, who have an equal share with us in the Sacrifice of the Altar, where we continually plead and represent before the Father that once-offered, finished sacrifice of Calvary; and, thirdly, that we need never be at a loss for some grave on which to lay our flowers, even if we have no personal friends of our own lying in the churchyard; for amongst the many green mounds which are nameless, "unremembered here," there are sure to be very few, if any, whose baptismal privileges did not entitle them to be regarded by us as inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, and as having been laid to rest in sure and certain *hope* of "the resurrection to eternal life." This, too, helps to instil in the minds of children "as they rove among the flowers in their young unclouded hours" that we must *all* die, and therefore we are never too young to begin to show our sympathy with the suffering and the bereaved ones. That our Queen is not a victim to the silly notion that we have nothing to do with those who before us have entered into rest, we well know. All honour be paid to her for that Christian belief in the resurrection to eternal life of *all* who are faithful unto death, be they prince or peasant. She believes that one and all are entitled to their heavenly inheritance if only they have fought a good fight, and finished their course with the joy of sins all blotted out, and she constantly evidences this her belief, whether it chance to be when she is taking part in a "Memorial Service" at the Mausoleum of her Consort Prince, or when she stands at the humbler tomb of a faithful attendant to place thereon a wreath of choice flowers.

One more thought. It is with regard to those who have come out of our hospitals cured. There is no period of life when we are more receptive of good or evil influence than when we are recovering from an illness, and our faculties open up to us again in renewed freshness and vigour. Then is the time to arouse Love within the soul. See then that by careful and judicious oversight the moral and spiritual welfare of your Patients are consulted. Draw them with the cords of love—press them into the service of Christ, and make them thrill with the Jubilee note of thankfulness. Thank God! I have no long record of debt and difficulty to unfold to-night. From the accounts which the Secretary was so kind as to lay before me yesterday, I gather that the Stroud Hospital is supported regularly, and with the ungrudging liberality which its mission of mercy deserves. In your loving loyalty then, I pray you, let the Jubilee Hospital Sunday in that town which both you and I delight to think of as "Dear old Stroud," be marked by an offering worthy of that blessed object which at the opening in January, 1876, was commended to the Great Healer in lines written for the occasion by a local poet. I feel that I cannot more appropriately conclude than by that same beautiful litany, whose words run as follows:—

Where the sick and weary are lying,
  Where poverty spreadeth her bed;
Where Charity sits by the dying,
  And Pity bends over the dead;
Where the cherished are left to the stranger,
  The desolate lighteth on love,
And Patience unruffled by anger,
  Waits meekly the word from above:
Blessed Son of the Virgin! look downward,
  Steal gently to hearts that are faint,
And drawing them upwards and onwards
  In mercy consider their plaint.
Where the rich and the joyous may hallow
  The blessings of ease and of wealth,
Occasion lies never long fallow,
  But glows with the earnest of health.
Where the Healer ennobles his calling,
  Nor barters his counsel for gain,
And woman's soft footsteps are falling
  Half hushed round the bedside of pain:
By the ills of the flesh Thou hast tasted,
  The sorrows for us Thou hast borne,
Lord! bind up the wounded and wasted,
  And whisper a hope to the worn.
Where the purest of earth may be lavish
  Of care for a brother in woe,
And smiles from the Master enravish
  The hearts which vain pleasures forego,
Where in *That* name the cup of cold water
  Is raised to the lips of the faint,
While Mercy unveils for her daughter
  The promised reward of the Saint,
Holy Christ of the Father! look downward,
  Apportion Thy Cross to the least,
And, shadowed by Thine, lead them onward,
  Their Saviour, their King, and their Priest.

◆

WE hear that Mr. Napleton's eloquent and touching sermon, which we print in another column, has been condemned by a local newspaper because of its "party politics." We fail to discover in it any partizanship except for loving loyalty to the Queen, a partizanship which, unfortunately, is distasteful to the Irish Nationalists and to their English sympathisers. Had Mr. Napleton preached on obedience to any one or more of the ten commandments, the same accusation might for the same reason have been preferred by the party which does not recognise that law and order are essential.

THE recumbent effigy of Bishop Fraser in white marble has arrived at Manchester Cathedral, and on Friday, the 24th ult., was placed on the alabaster cenotaph in the chapel at the south-east end of the chancel, which has been erected by Mrs. Fraser. The work, both as a piece of sculpture and as a likeness of the Bishop is regarded as one of the most successful that Mr. Forsyth has executed.

WE announce with deep regret the sudden death of the Rev. Harman Chaloner Ogle, Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen, which took place at Leeds on Saturday last. Mr. Ogle had not only the well-merited reputation of large scholarship and of wide learning, but showed a self-sacrificing devotion to the interests of religion and education. Only a few months ago he had offered himself for work as a missionary in the Archbishop's Mission to Assyria, and in the meantime had been studying Assyrian with a view to sailing for the East in August. Mr. Ogle carried all before him in his University career, taking the Ireland, Craven, and Denyer and Johnson Scholarships in succession, graduating in 1865 with a first class in *Lit. Hum.* He was some time Warden of Queen's College, Birmingham, and afterwards Head Master of Magdalen College School, which he resigned only about a year ago. He was appointed to preach the University sermon on St. John the Baptist's day.

ON Friday week the Bishop of Peterborough reopened the church at Tansor, near Oundle, a structure of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which had been restored under the direction of Mr. E. Christian, at a cost of £1,900.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and all **Pulmonary Affections** can be **immediately** relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE **Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.**
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials **FREE OF CHARGE** may be had on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ld.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 2, 1887.

PAROCHIAL ISOLATION.

ONE great feature of the Church of England is the parochial system, and it is this which marks the difference between her and the various Non-conforming sects, viz., that she provides for every parish a church and a clergyman, whose duty it is to minister to the bodily and spiritual wants of the people living in that parish, and that every one, rich and poor alike, can claim the attendance of his clergyman when in "need, sickness, or other adversity." While this has been the glory of our Church, we cannot but admit that in many large towns, where the demarcation of secular work and of parish boundaries exist, the actual practical work of several churches is more congregational than parochial, while the clergy are quietly performing their pastoral duties in their own sphere, the congregations are made up of people living in other parishes. There are several causes for this state of things; it may be that some have moved away to a pleasanter neighbourhood, yet still retain an affection for the old parish church, and so make it a point of duty to attend whenever possible. Others may be drawn from other parishes by curiosity, or by the preaching power of the vicar, or perhaps by the music and the ornate ritual. As a matter of fact, we know that the old system exists, but in name only.

On the other hand, in rural parishes the parochial system is carried out to the letter, the vicar, or rector, living among his people; they know him, and he knows them, the village is their little world, and they are little interested in what goes on beyond their own ken. There is much that is beautiful in all this, and where the work of God is going on apace, there is no sight so blessed as to see a parish at unity in itself. But there is a danger, lest this ideal life lead to isolation, and we question whether it would not be better for the Church at large, if there were not a little more hearty co-operation among various parishes. While it is well to be deeply engaged in their own concerns, we feel that Church people ought to see that they are members not only of the church in their own village, but of the great mystical Body of Christ, that the interest and welfare of every spiritual member is theirs also, and that their sympathies should be drawn out towards others, who also are members of one great body, scattered all over the world, of which Christ is the Head. We agree with a speaker at the recent Canterbury Diocesan Conference, that "the hearty co-operation of adjoining parishes would often prevent a School Board, and give life and vigour to societies, clubs, and other parochial institutions." In order to carry out this system of hearty co-operation, and to break down the barrier of parochial isolation, we would urge a more frequent exchange of pulpits. While at the Dissenting chapel there is constant change of preachers, at the parish church it is always the same, and while there is much in the fact that a resident clergyman is able to build up his people in the faith, and knowing their defects and their needs is able to rebuke the erring. At the same time we firmly believe that a change is good both for priest and people, and the very fact that a clergyman is standing before another congregation, may arouse some of the energy and animation of former days, and give life and vigour to his own work. And if it were possible, it would not be a bad thing if the rural brother could exchange duties with the town brother, the town clergyman would enjoy the restful change of two or three months, and learn the modes of thought among bucolic rustics, while the country parson would be all the better for being brought into contact with active minds and keen intellects, in the larger centre of population, and on his return home his people would benefit by the change, the sermons would be fresher,

> The daily round and common task

would be all the better done from the contact with the outer world.

So again in other ways parochial isolation might to a certain extent be broken down, and one is by having hearty united meetings for the promotion of mission and sanitary work, both at home and abroad. At the present time there is a discussion going on as to the cause of want of interest in missionary work. In many cases the cause is simply this: it is—or has been—customary to have a sermon once a year for some missionary society; the vicar or rector has taken the opportunity of getting a holiday on that Sunday, and beyond the sermon and usual collection little or nothing has been done. Now if there could be hearty co-operation of adjoining parishes in this matter, and real interest shown, then the people would be aroused, they would be led to feel that the cause of the Church abroad was one which affected *them* as well as others, and so in village festival and the like much might be done to bring about the spirit of true unity and concord.

The celebration of the Jubilee has been the means of calling forth interest in the Queen, in the services of the Church, and we hope in the Constitution; icy barriers have been broken down in these political and temporal matters, may it also be the same with regard to the Church. The more the corporate life of the Church is recognised and practically realised, the greater will be her usefulness and strength; and if we can only engraft this life into the minds of people then the day will be far distant when her enemies shall be able to carry out the wish to cast her down and destroy her. When they would say, "Down with her, down with her even to the ground," the voice of strong decided feeling amongst the people will be heard: "The Lord is with her and she shall not be removed." And the people themselves will not allow her to be destroyed because of the blessing that is in her.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHAT IS THE CHURCH.

SIR,—I have been interested in observing how, under the form of contradiction, "B." assents to and affirms the propositions which I stated regarding the Church. His style, indeed, whether from indistinctness of idea or inexpertness in the use of language, is somewhat difficult and obscure; but I think I understand him sufficiently to warrant what I have just said, as I will endeavour to show.

My position was briefly this, that the Church was at first an organised society, compacted together by visible bonds and ties into one body; that it lost this character, and became broken up into many independent societies or bodies, none of which can be called the Church exclusively or absolutely; and that the consequence of this change is that the visible Church, considered as the aggregate of such Churches, or of their baptised members, is not an organised society held in union by visible ties and bonds, but that such union as it possesses depends on invisible supersensible spiritual bonds.

"B." says that all this is faulty, "a set of fallacies," and proceeds to expound his own view in opposition to it. In doing so, he speaks of the Church's organisation and political (*i.e.*, visible and external) union under its pristine model; then of the loss subsequently of that visible union; and, finally, draws the conclusion that now the Church Catholic is not a body, because it is no longer politically organised, but that it is *spiritually organic*, through the relation of its individual members to the Divine Trinity.

Is it possible for two views to be less in contradiction, or more closely parallel?

I fear still that "B." has not got to the root of the matter; for, while emphatically appealing to Scripture, he slides into the use of a phrase which has no warrant in Scripture, and betrays a conception which is unscriptural. I allude to this use of the term "members of the Church Catholic."

I say that the expression is in opposition to St. Paul's ideal conception of *the Church*. With him Christians are members of Christ, not of the Church. And the difference is vital. To him the Church by itself is not a complete body, but a body *minus* the head. Its Head is Christ; He and it together make up the complete organisation. The Church is the body to Him as the Head—the trunk and limbs, or congeries of members, which, added to Him, the Head, constitute the complete mystical Christ. It is of Him, therefore, that Christians are members, not of the Church in the absolute sense. So our Catechism teaches, "whereby I was made a member of Christ." Of course, baptism makes men members of the *particular* Church into whose communion they are baptised. That concerns the fellowship of a visible, organised society. But, with regard to the Church absolute, the Body of Christ, the office of baptism is to make them members not of it, but of Him, and of one another in Him. And I call the distinction vital, because it shows the difference between the Pauline Church absolute, and any merely earthly ecclesiastical corporation or aggregate. The glorified Head and His Body, His members, make up a whole, which is ideal, heavenly, spiritual, and may not be confounded with its earthly counterparts, any more than the "Kingdom of Heaven" may be identified with its earthly image and representation, the visible Church.

Let me add a remark about the word "ideal" in this connection, as "B." finds fault with it. It expresses not the unreal or imaginary, but the perfect pattern towards which the Divine Spirit is evermore guiding the actual. I cannot understand how anyone can enter fully into the theology of St. Paul or St. John, without recognising how largely their statements are ideal. To them all existence is divided into two kingdoms, one of absolute light, the other of absolute darkness; one the abode of sinlessness, the other lying in the wicked one—one the object of all grace, the other doomed to the uttermost of wrath. By baptism or regeneration the individual passes at a bound, from the gloom and sin of the one into the light and purity of the other; he is transformed in his whole nature, becomes a new man, with whom old things have passed away and all things become new. Can any one miss seeing in all this an ideal representation, embodying eternal principles rather than actual transient facts. Such sharp lines of division, such absolute contrasts of qualities, are nowhere to be found in the present world. Here all is mixed, shaded in many degrees, good and evil mingled in all manner of proportions, men for the most part neither altogether saints nor altogether reprobate. Yet to this ideal contrast and severance divine evolution is moving forwards, and it shall become actual in the day when the mystery of God is fulfilled.

Just so, I would say with the Church. In the Divine idea, it is the immortal body of the mystical Christ, participant of the Divine nature, the complement or fulness of Him who filleth all in all. And towards this the actual Church is tending through manifold struggle and imperfection. Each visible body of Christians, in proportion as it lives by Christ, is imaging the ideal body to the eyes of men, and is contributing to the working out of the Divine purpose, the realisation of the divine idea. The actual is slowly being developed into the ideal, for the ideal is God's, and God's ideals can never fail to be accomplished.

PRESBYTER.

SIR,—I am not sure that the correspondence on this question is of sufficient interest to warrant its continuance. In any case my remarks this week will be few.

(1.) *A satisfactory Reply.*—"B." thinks I have failed to give one. I should say he holds his opinion in company with himself alone. I am justified in this by the fact that he does not say wherein my reply was unsatisfactory.

(2.) "*A Society was formed at Pentecost, and this Society was the Church.*"—Assertion is not proof. When "B" makes assertion, as I need scarcely say, he should be prepared with proofs. I ask him now to produce them.

(3.) *St. Paul and St. Luke speak of this Society as a Church.* Where? We shall then be able to see whether they "speak truly or falsely." (?!)

(4.) *The Church consists of all the Baptised, and it does not consist of all the Baptised.*—So speaks the following quotation—"Further, my references do not speak of the Church as consisting of all the baptised. But they speak of the Church: and, according to all the New Testament contains, all who are baptised are of the Church, and none others." Is this penned seriously or is it solemn trifling?

(5.) *One Baptism.*—"B." must kindly excuse my saying that he has a strange disposition to pervert what is written. I do not suppose that any other reader has understood what I wrote to contradict the scriptural teaching respecting Baptism. There is but one Baptism. But Baptism is incomplete without the thing signified. "I, indeed, baptise you with water . . . . . but He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost." Does "B." imagine that the mere performance of the rite is saving? Then were the preaching and baptism of the Baptist sufficient. There was no necessity for the Saviour's work. Does he now see where the fallacies lie?

(6.) "*The Catholic Church is not a Body, because it is not politically organised.*"—This sentence occurs in a paragraph which, I should think, none but "B." understands. I select it and hold it up for inspection. If it is sarcasm it lacks point. If it is part of the argument it will be difficult to determine how it dovetails. The Church is Christ's Body. True Christians are members. He Himself is the Head. How does (6) square, or otherwise, with this definition?

(7.) *Apply a Test.*—Go to a man, tell him he has been baptised, has been taught the catechism etc., etc. Ask him if he dare die. He will answer you that one thing is lacking. He has observed outwardly all that Christians need observe; but he has not made it a soul-question. He needs and must have justification and sanctification. "Without holiness shall no man see the Lord." Most of us know that we must have something before we die, or we cannot hope for heaven. This something is the Spirit's baptism. They who have it are true members of the Church. The grand question, therefore, for all is this, "Have I been baptised with the Spirit?"

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, Thrapston,
June 25th, 1887.

◆

SIR W. PHILLIMORE ON HYMNS, ETC.

SIR,—This learned baronet has always supported the Ritualistic party through thick and thin. At the recent E. C. U. anniversary in London, he of course attacked the Privy Council judgments and "Lord Penzance's Court." When convenient the Ritualists can quote Privy Council law with approval; for instance, we often hear the Bennett decision spoken of with approval, because it let the gentleman off with a caution. The learned baronet is angry because the singing of the *Agnus Dei* after Prayer of Consecration was forbidden. He says that "from their childhood the hymns of Tate and Brady were imported into the middle of the Communion Service, when the clergyman went to change his dress," etc. How simple must this Ritualistic baronet think us! Our fathers sang psalms, etc., why should not we poor Ritualists be allowed to do so? But did our forefathers sing hymns, kneeling after the bread and wine had been consecrated? hymns clearly meant as acts of adoration to a Body of Christ believed to be present in the "species" of bread on the altar? Did they, I ask? If they did, and if the Prayer Book allowed such adoration, it would, of course, be most unjust to forbid it now. But Sir Walter knows very well that they did nothing of the sort, and that the Sacrament is not to be "worshipped." Yet he pretends that the singing of Tate and Brady, and the singing of Ritualistic Eucharistic hymns, are one and the same thing! Disingenuousness is, I fear, a characteristic feature of modern Ritualists. He also says that "Poor Mr. Mackonochie was condemned for a simple genuflection during the Consecration Prayer." He might as well say of a soldier who was punished for refusing to salute his superior officer, that "the poor fellow was condemned for simply not raising his hand to his forehead at a certain moment." It is not the act, but the spirit in which the act is done or left undone that is considered. Traitors and rebels, whether in the army or the Church, must either conform loyally to the regulations and rubrics, or else suffer for their obstinacy.

OXONIENSIS.

◆

THE CONSECRATION OF THE PARTHENON.

"Time is a child at play."—HERACLITUS.

THE Parthenon, Athens' pride and crown,
Was finished; every hammer's sound was hushed,
The marble's splintery dust was cleared away,
And all was ready for the joyful rite
Of consecration; when, before the crowd
Began to gather, an Athenian came,
Whose intellect was nurtured in the schools
Of ancient song and high philosophy;—
He came for one long satisfying gaze
Upon the perfect work; and, as he mused,
His thoughts found words, and with himself he spake:

What toil of slaves have built these walls !
What wealth of dimly burning gold,
And lustrous marble, pure and cold,
Is gathered in these sacred halls !

But far more precious than the hand
Of slave, is that high intellect
Which gave the free-souled architect
O'er matter his sublime command ;

And far more precious than the gold
And marble of this holy shrine,
The sculptured images divine
Their glorious beauty here unfold.

To this—the beauty's perfect height—
All being evermore ascends.
Whate'er has force and motion tends
To life, and harmony, and light ;

But when the eternal spirit rolls
Blindly no more through life and death ;
When now it lives in human breath,
And thinks and feels in human souls ;

Then perfect beauty first has birth,
The product of the artist's thought ;
Then sculptured forms like these are wrought,
More beautiful than aught of earth.

So let us now rejoice, that we
Have lived to build this glorious fane,
And given it beauty to remain
In earthly immortality.

He ceased, and mingled with the festive throng,
And joined in every gorgeous gladsome rite
As gaily as the gayest there, till even
Sent home the crowds, all weary of their joys,
And down he laid to rest, but could not sleep ;
So to the Parthenon he wandered back,
And gazed upon the moonbeams as they fell
Full on the Colonnades. All earth and heaven
Were hushed. And then, like stars that hide from day
But shine at night, for other thoughts arose
Upon his spirit, and again he spake ;

Oh, what is art to those who groan ?
And what is glory to the dead ?
When mightier death has bowed his head,
The hero knows not Victory's tone ;

And all those myriads who to deeds
Of fame and glory are not born,
Whose life no beauteous arts adorn,
Are they no more than wasted seeds ?

Oh, can we hope for, after this,
Another, a diviner life,
Free from the taint of wrong and strife,
And all that is at war with bliss ?

Is there a world beyond the grave,
Where justice reigns ;—where deathless shame
Awaits triumphant wrong, and fame
Will crown the unsuccessful brave ?

Is there a better, kindlier land,
Where those we deemed but wasted seeds,
Because they wrought no worthy deeds,
May into flower and fruit expand ?

I fear the Ephesian sage is right ;
That nought endures but only change.
What's now familiar will be strange ;
And day is swallowed up of night.

From earth we come, to earth return ;
Whatever has been born must die.
Perhaps the stars that burn on high
To ashes in their time may turn ;

And this our temple, which we call
Eternal in its strength and grace,
Barbarian armies may deface,
Or earthquakes shatter to its fall.

For time is as a child at play,
Creating and destroying still.
Alike to him are good and ill ;
Together both are swept away.

Then what in boundless space are we ?
And what in endless time am I ?
Mere clouds upon the eternal sky,
Mere foam upon the the eternal sea !

Yet surely there is hope to find
Wherever there is power to seek ;
And we could never think or speak
Of light, had we from birth been blind.

Is he but like a breaking wave
Who gazed on beauty with delight,
Who longed for knowledge, strove for right,
And died, his fatherland to save ?

There comes no answer. From the shore
We watch the billows, while the sea
Before us lies a mystery
Whose depths we never can explore.

O, could some power divine, illume
This life of ours, its sorrows cheer,
Its gladness purify, and clear
The awful mystery of the tomb !

Or could the universal Mind
Which through all being ever rolls,
And kindles into life our souls,
Reveal itself to humankind !

O mighty Mind, thou art supreme !
O Nature thou art infinite !
Our ignorance is densest night ;
Our knowledge but a taper's gleam.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

* * *

SOME beneficed clergymen in the county of Essex have submitted to the Archbishop of Canterbury the following remarks on the 15th section of the Church Patronage Bill now before Parliament :—" The section provides a method for the removal of incapacitated incumbents from their benefices. The retiring allowance is not in any case to exceed one-third of the net income of the living without the parsonage house. We submit that the pension is too small in the case of aged incumbents. We are told that in the case of army chaplains and gaol chaplains pensions as high as two-thirds of the full stipend are given after long service. So also in the Civil Service and with Excise officers. In many cases if two-thirds of the income be taken from a living, an inadequate provision will remain. Would it not be best in such cases to retain the present system ? With a curate the duties are performed, and an aged incumbent, though unfit for active work, might have a useful influence in his parish. So also might his family.

Section 15 adopts the provisions of an Act for voluntary resignation. We submit that these provisions are not adapted to compulsory resignation. For instance, there is a *maximum* but not a *minimum* pension. The patron has an appeal, but not the incumbent; if the case fails the incumbent has to pay all costs. Lastly, there is by section 15 no protection to vested interests. This, we submit, is contrary to precedent and, we think, to just principles of legislation. We have ventured to submit these considerations to your Grace because we are ourselves seriously interested in this matter, and we are very sensible of the influence which your opinion must exercise upon its decision." The document is signed by Beresford Harris, R.D., rector of Runwell, Essex; A. W. Bullen, vicar of Great Baddow; Stanley T. Gibson, rector of Sandon; Thomas Rogers, vicar of Roxwell; E. F. Gepp, vicar of High Easter, R.D.; James Thomas Fowler, rector of of East Hanningfield; A. Cyril Pearson, rector of Springfield; T. L. Papillon, vicar of Writtle; E. Spencer Tiddeman, rector of West and South Hanningfield; J. P. Bridges, rector of Danbury; J. P. Tweed, rector of Little Waltham; W. Trimmer, vicar of Broomfield.

THE heart of Nicholas of Ely (says the *Hants Chronicle*) is known to be buried in the wall of the parclose in the south aisle of the choir of the cathedral by the inscription cut in Fox's work, who doubtless saw and carefully covered in the ancient cist, and placed on his stonework this inscription:—*Intus est cor Nicolai olim Winton Episcopi cuius Corpus est apud Waverlei.* In constructing Bishop Courtenay's monument and tomb for his remains found in the crypt, a part of a sepulchral slab of Edmund, son of Alfred, was removed (it once was in Gardner's chantry, and Edmund's bones are in Fox's chest), and in preparing a position for this within the choir the place where Nicholas's heart is was opened, and the Dean decided reverently to examine the spot. After the stone seat was removed a fine slab of grey marble 20in. square was found, and under it a somewhat smaller block of stone. Removing carefully the Purbeck, a square of lead with Latin inscription, and morticed into the lower stone, was found, with its centre roughly raised, so as to protect, but not break, something under. Lifting this out, the "enshrined heart" of the Bishop and its envelopes were found in a cavity of the stone nine inches deep. It presented a dark and somewhat decayed appearance, and on being removed to the light its small weight showed that the effect of time had reduced both vessel and contents. It is presumed to be a pewter case or vase, and it is enveloped carefully in a silk or damask napkin, fringed, and sewn round the upper part. The base where the heart is presumed to have been put in is soldered on. The Dean would not allow any uncovering of the vessel, and after Mr. F. J. Baigent had taken careful sketches of the "interment" and of the plate of lead, the receptacle and its contents were again carefully closed and secured. The heart, doubtless, in its long burial of upwards of six hundred years has assumed the dried leaf appearance of that of the lion-hearted Richard of Rouen. The inscription on the lead plate was:—*Hic inhumatum est Cor Nicholai Hely qui obiit anno* MCCLXXIX., *Pridie Idus Februari.* Bishop Nicholas was Bishop of Worcester, and was translated to Winchester. Whilst at the former see he was Lord Chancellor and also Lord High Treasurer.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Corfe, Rev. E. C., M.A., Organising Secretary for the Additional Curates' Society, Metropolitan District.

Crawley, Rev. S., M.A., Head Master of Lutterworth Grammar School; Licensed Preacher in Diocese of Peterborough.

Cunningham, Rev. William, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary-the-Great, Cambridge.

Dowman, Rev. Charles, Rector of Fletton, Huntingdonshire.

Eden, Rev. George R., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Auckland; Rural Dean of Auckland.

Ellison, Rev. David, Rector of All Saints', Chorlton-on-Medlock.

Farrar, Rev. C. D., B.A., late Senior Curate of St. Mary's. Lewisham; Vicar of Micklefield, Yorkshire.

Fuller, Rev. J. M., Vicar of Bexley; Rural Dean of East Dartford.

Hicks, Rev. John Wale, M A., Curate; Vicar of St. Mary-the-Less, Cambridge.

Hilliard, Rev. Ernest Strafford, Secretary East London Church Fund, and Mission Chaplain to the Bishop of Bedford.

Krauss, Rev. Frederic, B.A., Chaplain at Adlington Hall, and at Mottram Hall, Cheshire; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.

Lobley, Rev. J. A., Vicar of Sedbergh, Yorkshire.

Thomas, Rev. David, M.A., Vicar of Loders, Dorset.

Tilly, Rev. John, Curate of Llangattock Vibon Avel; Perpetual Curate of St. Arvan's, Monmouthshire.

Whitworth, Rev. Richard Charles, M.A., Vicar of Wilshampstead, Bedford.

Williams, Rev. J. Hughes, M.A., Assistant Organising Secretary for the Additional Curates' Society, South-Western District.

Winter, Rev. C. P., M.A., Organising Secretary for the Additional Curates' Society, Midland District.

Woodhouse, Rev. R. J., M.A., Senior Curate of Kensington; Incumbent of the New District of St. Luke's, Bromley Common.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bagnell, Rev. Henry William, Rector of Nuffield, Retired Military Chaplain, Bombay Presidency, on the 23rd ult.

Calthrop, Rev. Henry, B.D., formerly Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Prebendary of London in Lichfield Cathedral, and Rector of Great Braxted, at Lauderdale, Torquay, on the 21st ult., aged 84.

Coldham, Rev. George, at Glemsford Rectory, Suffolk, on the 26th ult., aged 83.

De Crespigny, Rev. Frederick John Champion De Crespigny, M.A., Vicar of Hampton Wick, at Hampton Wick Vicarage, on the 25th ult., aged 64.

Hillier, Rev. Dr. John, J.P., suddenly, at Sandwich, on the 23rd ult., aged 85.

Hutton, Rev. Vernon Wollaston, Prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral, formerly Vicar of Sneinton, Nottingham, at Bournemouth, on the 21st ult. aged 45.

Mountfield, Rev. David, Rector of Loftus-in-Cleveland, at Harrogate, on the 19th ult., aged 60.

Ogle, Rev. Harman Chaloner, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, and late Head Master of Magdalen College School, and Priest-elect to the Assyrian Church, at the Queen's Hotel, Leeds, on the 25th ult., aged 44.

Overton, Rev. C. F., M.A., Oxon, Assistant-Vicar of St. George's Cathedral, second son of the Vicar of Cottingham, Yorks, at Grahamstown, Cape Colony, on the 23rd ult., aged 48.

Smith, Rev. Charles Edgar, M.A., late Vicar of Nackington, at St. George's Place, Canterbury, on the 23rd ult., aged 90.

Tate, Rev. Francis Blackburne, M.A., late Vicar of Charing, and son of the Rev. J. Tate, late Canon of St. Paul's, at Devon College, Churchill Road, Guildford, on the 24th ult., aged 79.

Taylor, Rev. George, Vicar of Kirdford, Sussex, in London, on the 22nd ult.

Wood, Rev. Matthew, M.A., at Kington Vicarage, on the 21st ult., aged 55.

York, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Great Eversden and Rector of Little Eversden, Cambs., on the 18th inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

By the Rev. J. Ll. ROBERTS, M.A., Vicar of Spratton, Hon. Canon of Peterborough, Formerly Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford.

An Embertide Address to the Ordination Candidates, Delivered in the Private Chapel at Peterborough, on Saturday, June 4th, 1887.

"Give ye them to eat."—St. Mark vi. 37.

WE who are called to the "sacred ministry" of the Church are called therein to the office of teachers in that Church; nor only so, we are the authorised exponents of divine truth to the world.

Of course in the very early years of our ministry this office devolves upon us with many limitations, and should be exercised with great modesty. But those early years supply the most valuable training for its fuller and more influential exercise hereafter, and thus to prepare is the duty and the privilege of every young clergyman. Whether in sermons, in catechising or in personal intercourse the "Pastor Parochiæ" is especially a teacher. If he be a man of weight and character his influence in this respect, direct or indirect, will probably be far greater even than he is aware. It may be of a very quiet character; it may, and indeed will be, if really for good, very gradual in its growth, but the influence of a thoughtful, earnest man, known to be a student of the Word of God, is great in his lifetime, and is precisely that influence which lives beyond him.

Nor should it be forgotten that this office of a teacher of the things of God is one of vastly increased responsibility, and of peculiar difficulty in an age of intellectual activities like our own. The inner circle of those who pursue accurate knowledge, and cultivate accurate habits of thought is greatly enlarged, whilst information of a general kind, and the habit of loose and inaccurate speculation is very widely diffused. Under these circumstances the office of religious teacher may indeed be more interesting, but it will require more careful training, and must needs be exercised with greater caution than in those periods of dull acquiescence which have, with an unconscious sarcasm, been denominated the "Ages of Faith." The influence of authority is reduced even below its reasonable and right dimensions; a man's statements are taken for what they are, or at least for what they appear to be worth, and he moves in an atmosphere of criticism, often of contradiction, which, however at times unpleasant, is by no means unsalutary for himself.

Since, therefore, my friends, I am permitted to address you to-night, I have proposed to myself, by God's help, to lay before you what appear to me to be very important principles bearing upon our discharge of this great office of commissioned teachers in the Church of God; principles, important at all times, but peculiarly so at present, when very much has happened to shake the faith of men, or at least greatly to change its bearings.

In regard to the primary questions of religious faith, the being and authority of God, the immortality of the soul, and the future of mankind after death, there are at present two claimants for the chair of ultimate appeal. These are the Intellect and the Conscience. It is the tendency of the nineteenth century to decide in favour of the former; to make the reason the final and sole arbiter in such questions, and to clothe it with authority to discard at pleasure all moral and spiritual obligations which do not approve themselves to its judgment.

It was the great work of Bishop Butler, in the last century, and of those powerful minds which he so largely influenced, to establish on the other hand the supremacy of conscience not only as judging and regulating actions, but as recognising those foundation truths of faith and morals which are, as I believe, antecedent to and in that sense independent of logical demonstration, though very far from incapable of abundant corroboration.

I mention, only to omit from our consideration at present, a third somewhat petulant and presumptuous claimant of authority in all matters of religion; most useful indeed and of the highest value in its proper sphere, but always thrusting itself beyond its sphere, and so capable of incalculable mischief, I mean the imagination.

But it is to the rival claims of the two former that I would at present ask your attention; so much of the present modes of thought turns upon this controversy, and so much will our position as religious teachers be affected for good or evil by the ground which we take with regard to it.

I will endeavour to make my meaning plain by an example.

A man may come to us and say, "You tell me to believe in God, in the immortality of the soul, in its future never-ending happiness or misery, in the moral government of God. You call upon me to believe these doctrines, notwithstanding certain difficulties attaching, it may be, to each of them, and you charge me with moral culpability if I reject them. Now I tell you plainly that my reason gives me no sufficient proof of any of these beliefs; and beside my reason I admit no other guide. I decline to force my reason. I will not put pressure upon my intellect. I do not indeed go so far as to deny these things, nor do I see why I should give myself any further trouble in the matter. To my mind your statements are unproved, and therefore with me they carry no weight. I do not understand why you should blame me or hold me responsible for my belief. Do not call me an Atheist, for I do not care to deny God. Do not call me a Theist, for I as little care to assert Him. I repeat, the existence of God, at least in the Christian sense of a personal Creator and Moral Governor of the Universe, is incapable of demonstration, so is the immortality and future condition of the soul, if indeed the soul exist at all. That which is undemonstrated is to my mind as non-existent, and I hold myself perfectly free from all those moral and spiritual obligations which upon these grounds you urge upon me."

This, broadly, but as I believe not unfairly stated, is the position of the Agnostic. It is exceedingly important that we should understand it.

It may be that, as he says, the being, authority, and personal character of God are not capable of demonstration, for partly they are anterior to demonstration, partly they are too wide and too expansive a subject for demonstration to our reason, but partly and chiefly they rest upon grounds independent of our reason. We do not believe in God simply because we are satisfied with the intellectual proofs of His existence; nor does the first, nor the second, nor the third intellectual difficulty destroy the grounds of our faith in Him.

We believe in God first on the grounds of conscience and of the affections, from the very instincts of our nature, and from the necessities of our being. And the same is true of the spiritual nature, and of the immortality of the soul, and the man who denies these does violence to himself and to his humanity.

Certainly there is evidence, powerful and abounding evidence, of these truths, but it is necessarily—as Butler points out—"probable" evidence, and does not and cannot amount to actual demonstration. Indeed, Pascal well observes that no writer of Holy Scripture ever attempted a "natural proof" of God. They did not need it, they could and did assume it.

It is therefore to conscience and to the affections that the appeal lies—and to these, unless they are greatly clouded and debased, it will not be made in vain. It is the affections which are the true witness against materialism. Men will never consent that they whom they love should perish as the brutes.

It is conscience, which is the true witness against Atheism, for he who denies God destroys the foundations of all moral responsibility.

It is very unlikely, my friends, that you will meet with the agnostic argument thus broadly stated. The man and woman who thus feel, or who profess thus to think, have probably in most cases never distinctly analysed their sentiments, but it is beyond a doubt that this which I have described is largely the attitude of society towards religious truth. As a matter of fact it is that which has been impressed, and that with lamentable success into the minds of some among the working classes of my own village. Mr. Herbert Spencer and others may have formulated the philosophical principles, the coarser results will find coarser and more fitting exponents.

But if we regard this subject from another aspect, one even more closely touching ourselves, is not what has been said the legitimate expansion and application of that most deep and searching rule of duty which Christ our Saviour has given us in this matter. "To love the Lord our God with all our mind, with all our understanding"?

The mind which to any purpose could approach the study of religious truth must come prepared and disciplined by the love of God. It must come in reverence and in love. It must come as to that which is of all interests the nearest and most precious to itself, but which is also, of all things, immeasurably greater and vaster than its powers. It will bow in deep humility before the mysteries of the divine Being, it will be content to know in part, whilst confessing that to God itself is known wholly and without reserve. It was said of the Apostolic Fletcher that he never wrote controversy but upon his knees; the true student of the things of God will never search into the things of God but in the mental attitude of prayer.

Such a mind is conscious of its own littleness: of the narrow limits of its powers, of the clouds and mists that hang about it; but it is conscious too of a kind of infinity even in itself, of the infinity that is in its aspirations, stretching forth every way after the true, and the holy, and the pure, athirst, aye, for the living God, and therefore it knows that its God is infinite, throned in mystery unfathomable, in power, in majesty, in goodness inexhaustible. It knows that it grasps but the very skirts of the robe of light. It knows that if it would live in the knowledge of God it must live in mystery, in the mystery of holiness, in mystery, of the exquisite, the surpassing mystery of prayer.

How different is this from the self-sufficient attitude of the philosopher of the nineteenth century, who examines into the depths of the divine Being, and into the profundities of the soul of man, as though he held in his hands some chemical substance whose dimensions he could measure, and whose properties he could explain; a philosopher superior above all things to mysteries, and unconscious above all things of the limitations of his powers.

Think much, think deeply my younger friends, of what must be the attitude towards things divine of him who loves the Lord his God with all his mind. How humble, how teachable, how sincere, how full of faith and love and of prayer will he be in his search for truth; and then, with what power will he come forth to stir and to teach and to build up the souls of men. Yes, of a truth, he, and he only is the teacher of spiritual truth who loves the Lord his God with all his mind.

I have felt, my friends, that I should perhaps do you some service in setting before your view the strength and clearness which our mental powers gain from these qualities of humility and chastened love. It has struck me very forcibly of late that the revolution of thought and opinion has brought us very much into the condition of society in the eighteenth century. The Church and nation are moved by a like reaction from a dogmatic revival pushed perhaps to its extreme; the like resistance to authority, the appeal to which had become perhaps overstrained; the like weariness of controversy upon a multitude of points which seem minute and frivolous, at least to those outside the dispute, which followed the times of the non-jurors. There is the same undue worship of the human intellect, and the same undue reliance upon its conclusions, and, alas! as recent revelations have but too sadly shown, the same relaxation of morals following upon a disturbance of men's faith. I am not speaking from a sense of despondency or even of regret. The warfare of the Faith and of Religion is unceasing. The battle shifts from one portion of the field to another; in this world the Church will not find peace. I may add that perhaps it is not desirable that she *should* do so; but what I am anxious to point out is this, that the conditions of our own time lead us and require us to study and to enforce the first principles of doctrine and of morals, and I believe that it is far from an unhappy thing that this should be so. It seems to me that we stand very much where Butler stood in the day when he made his grand appeal to conscience, to the deep sense of responsibility which God has planted in the soul of man, and to the yet deeper consciousness of those great mysteries by which he is surrounded.

It was Butler who taught men, and laid them under a never-ending obligation in so teaching them that conscience is enthroned above intellect; aye, that she is stronger than intellect and more divine.

It may be that God in His providence is recalling us from what I may term the "frivolities" of doctrine. I mean from dwelling so perpetually upon the secondary aspects of secondary truths; issues which to the world at large, and to the stronger and more serious minds within the Church, seem absolutely disproportionate to the place and the occasion.

And here, my friends, I may venture to express a hope that the minds of our rising clergy may be directed to those stores of deep and masculine theology with which our fathers adorned their shelves, and which their sons have left there in venerable dust. I have never ceased to cherish my gratitude for the fact that my first curacy placed me in a church in which these stores had been rescued from the parvise above the porch, and with a scholarly vicar who could guide one to their treasures, with the shrewd and learned Jerome, Augustine and Chrysostom among the Fathers. the Colloquies and Paraphrase of Erasmus, the sweet wisdom of Mede and of Taylor and of Andrewes, the strong sense of Paley and the stately periods of Horsley were among the treasures which our forefathers stored up for the uses of an archdeaconry. The men whom I have mentioned and others the great writers of the English Church had varied excellencies as they had their own defects; but this at least they had in common, and it is no little praise, *they never belittled their theology.*

But if one turns to another quarter, the great preachers of the Gallican Church, that Church at one time in such sympathy with our own, to Bourdaloue, and Bossuet and Massillon, there is one great lesson that they teach most important for our day. It is this that they were one and all (and herein lay one great secret of their power), they were one and all well and deeply trained in moral philosophy, they knew, and that in a marvellous degree, the nature of those whom they taught.

There are two subjects which as effective teachers of divine things we must know: we must study, and must progressively understand, I mean that word of God we teach, and those human hearts to which we teach it. It is possible, I believe, at present for a young man to leave the English Universities profoundly ignorant of both. It is not possible one would hope in such ignorance to enter holy orders. But the study of both is the study of a life: and one important fact concerning them is this: that the study of the one throws constant light upon the other, and Scripture is an inexhaustible source of illumination in both.

To these studies, therefore, my friends, let me commend you. To the study of the word and will of God. To the study of the heart and ways of man. And this in that spirit of humility and duty which is the source of wisdom.

He who bade us love the Lord our God with all our mind, bade us also love our neighbour as ourself.

The heart of man is in a peculiar manner the work of God. He breathed into him the living soul. And therefore the heart of man partakes of the divine element of mystery. The mystery of godliness, the mystery of immortality, the mystery of love, and that which I mentioned before, the exquisite mystery of prayer. But, alas, beneath all these, introducing endless difficulty and perplexity into them all is that mystery which I dare not call divine, the mystery of sin. Above them all, filling all with joy and light and peace, and at the last we doubt not, reconciling and explaining all, the mystery of Divine Love.

The heart of the teacher must be touched with mystery: he must feel the greatness of those fields he treads: and lest in their vastness he be lost, he must seek the guiding thread of the Spirit and of the Word of God.

It has seemed to me sometimes as though there were in our ministrations a strange want of perception of the proportion of things. I have once or twice left a church and asked how can the teacher of divine truths rest in trivialities like these. And I have anxiously inquired if the same question may not have more than once been asked concerning myself. The sermon may have been clever, pretty, interesting nay, eloquent—but not deep. By which I mean it has not touched the depths of the Divine Revelation or of the human heart. You may say, would you have us go beyond our depth? assuredly not, and in your early years I would have you very modest, very simple—but my dear friends,—and this is a great truth—simplicity, if true, is deep. To you at present I would not say "Be deep!" but I would say, "drink of the depths!" Drink of Scriptures, drink of St. Paul, drink—I had almost said yet more deeply—of St. John. And next to Scriptures, if you can read Augustine, drink of him. He, more than any whom I know, has felt the deep things of God and man, and hence his wondrous power. Yet, St. Augustine spoke to men more dense and ignorant than almost any whom we teach.

Remember, too, how different a thing is power—I mean power for God—from popularity. The man who probes the conscience is not popular, but he is powerful. A man is often most powerful when he is least praised—most influential when he knows it not. He is powerful when he has set forth clearly and in simplicity the lines of duty: when he has made men think of God and of themselves—they do not think of him then, but they think much of him when he dies, and his thoughtful, honest, and loving words are remembered round his grave.

But his God thinks of him always, and never leaves nor forsakes the man of prayer. He enlightens him with His spirit; He strengthens him with His grace; He carries home His own word into the hearts of men to bear fruit in due season.

Then, my friends, love God and the things of God. Love Him with your hearts and with your understanding. And love men, love them in their weakness and their sin, love them even in their bitterness and opposition, love them in their danger and in the sadness of that hour which must come.

The deeper, the more earnest, the more conscientious your Christian ministry, the more certain will be your trials and your contests. Meet them in humility and faith and love, and your God will bring you through them in Peace.

Be ye taught by His Spirit, and live by His grace: so fed of Him ye shall feed His flock. Ye shall receive of His Hands, and "give them to eat."

THE VICTORIAN AGE.

By the Rev. PHILIP T. BAINBRIGGE, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Regent Street, London.

Preached at the Church of St. Thomas, Regent Street, on Sunday Morning, June 26th, 1887.

"Sing unto the Lord a new song, and His praise from the end of the earth; ye that go down to the sea, and all that is therein, the isles and the inhabitants thereof."—Isaiah xlii. 10.

Last Sunday night, in this Church of St. Thomas, we raised our solemn *Te Deum* of thanks to God, "King of Kings, Lord of Lords, the only Ruler of Princes," for that it hath pleased Him "of His favour to behold our most gracious Sovereign Lady, Queen Victoria," and to grant unto her full fifty years of sceptred sway. And those who were present at that service are not likely to forget soon the impressive dignity, the sonorous music, the devout enthusiasm, which were its distinguishing marks.

Since then, during all the week, we have scarcely thought or talked of anything else than the august procession through the streets, the ceremonial in the grey, historic, Abbey of Westminster, the gathering of the children in Hyde Park, the bonfires on a hundred hills, the tidings of congratulation and rejoicing from the ends of the earth, wherever our English tongue is spoken, and "Victoria" is a household word.

In ancient days in England those beacon lights were a signal of war, and of imminent danger of sudden attack, an urgent and imperative summons to arms,—

When that great fleet, invincible, against her bore in vain
The richest spoils of Mexico, the stoutest hearts of Spain.
For swift to east and swift to west the ghastly war-flame spread,
High on St. Michael's Mount it shone, it shone on Beechy Head;
Far on the deep the Spaniard saw, along each southern shire,
Cape beyond cape, in endless range, those twinkling points of fire.
Southward from Surrey's pleasant hills flew those bright couriers forth;
High on bleak Hampstead's swarthy moor they started for the north;
And on and on, without a pause, untired they bounded still;
All night from tower to tower they sprang, they sprang from hill to hill;

Till Skiddaw saw the fire that burned on Gaunt's embattled pile,
And the red glare on Skiddaw roused the burghers of Carlisle.

How vividly Macaulay's spirited lines help us to picture the scene! the swift sending the signal of strife. Now, once more, fires have been kindled on many of those self-same heights, to speed a message of peace; while among the numerous and brilliant company of welcomed guests from friendly nations are the illustrious and honoured delegates of Spain.

The contrast between *now* and *then*, between *past* and *present*, in this one respect, strikes me as being not only remarkable in itself, and worthy of notice on that account, but as being representative in a peculiar degree of the changed condition of things, and of the special glory of the Victorian age. When we compare the Queen's reign with those of the only two French monarchs who were on the throne fifty years, or of our own three Kings—the third Henry, the third Edward, and the third George—whose reigns have equalled hers in length, we must gratefully acknowledge that for rich blessings of undisturbed security, of increased education, of enormous improvement in the well-being of our people, we have indeed abundant cause to "give glory unto the Lord, and declare His praise in the islands."

The prophet, in the chapter of my text, foreshadows a King, who shall reign in righteousness, who shall be a mighty man of war, and in the power of the Lord shall prevail over his enemies, but the chief characteristic of whose kingdom shall be peace, and its crowning glory the opening blind eyes, the bringing out prisoners from the prison, the undoing heavy burdens, the dealing of bread to the hungry, the clothing and caring for the poor; and although the complete fulfilment of this prophecy may yet be far off, and we may have long to wait for it, I venture to assert that there never has been a period of fifty years, in any country during the world's history, which has been so notably signalised as this past half-century has been by peaceful triumphs such as these.

It is true, alas! that not yet has the age of "universal peace through sea and land" been ushered in, even for Great Britain's favoured empire. Witness the grim struggle in the Crimea, the horrors and suspense of the Indian Mutiny, the hideous atrocities of the massacre at Cawnpore, the eighty-seven days' siege of the Residency at Lucknow, Havelock's forced marches 'neath a scorching sun, campaigns in Abyssinia and Ashantee, in Afghanistan and Zululand, in Egypt and the Transvaal, the heroic defence made quite lately at Khartoum by the devoted, and all but deserted, Gordon. Yet in spite of all these, some of them perhaps unavoidable, and some, it may be, unnecessary wars, the broad fact remains plain and unchallenged, that within our own borders God has given us in full measure the blessing of peace. Wide enfranchisement of the people; generous removal of sectarian disabilities; stringent measures against over-long and burdensome and degrading work for women and children in mines and factories; careful provision to secure that our gallant sailors are not sent to sea in unseaworthy or too heavily-laden ships; multiplied lighthouses and life-boat stations; vastly increased accommodation and efficiency in hospitals and convalescent homes and institutions for the blind, and deaf and dumb, and all manner of afflicted persons,—these are some—and merely a few—of the things contributing greatly to the public weal which have undeniably been brought to pass in the course of fifty years, and on account of which it may well be said: "Sing unto the Lord a new song, and His praise from the end of the earth; ye that go down to the sea, and all that is therein, the isles and the inhabitants thereof."

And when we turn from measures of public policy, and from the incidents of our national life, to consider that which is specially dear to us who are gathered here this morning, namely, the state of Christ's Church—what an improved condition of things is observable!

Fifty years ago the Church existed, indeed, but because of her dulness, her apathy, her dreary formality, her utter want of spirituality, she must have been accounted well-nigh dead before God! She did not live, she lingered! Clergy slack, slovenly, heartless in their ministrations; lay-folk scarcely recognising in any way or shape that they were members of the Church of Christ, or that any other duties devolved upon them in regard to it than to put in an occasional, or it might be regular, attendance at their parish church on Sunday, where the rich man had his cushioned and carpeted and luxurious pew, while the poor were thrust aside into dark and uncomfortable corners; churches closely locked and barred from one week's end to another, except for an hour or two on Sunday, rebuffing with their "hard Protestant doors" all who came—if haply any cared enough to come—in search of quiet, rest, and hallowed place for prayer, to the earthly house and Presence Chamber of our Father in Heaven. How changed is all this now! How changed for the better! Everywhere, in constantly increasing numbers, churches free to all, all welcome, rich and poor, one with another, as it is here; churches open constantly for private devotion. Early Celebrations, daily Celebrations, short and cheery services for children; laymen freely and gladly spending time and talents in Church work, in the service of the Sanctuary, in choirs, in schools, in clubs, and other efforts to afford recreation and innocent amusement to those whose lives would otherwise be lacking in brightness and joy. Women also, anxious and eager to do work for Jesus, to be "ministering angels" to the sick and sorrowful souls, to whom Christ ministered, and to win back, if possible, to paths of purity and peace, the poor lost sheep whom Jesus came to seek and save.

My brethren, I am well aware that there is a reverse side to the medal. There are many blots yet—and foul ones, too!—defacing the fair escutcheon of England; many matters still to be amended in the conduct of the Church, and of the individual members of that Body of Christ.

But I do not want to divert your attention to these this morning. I do not want you to fly off at a tangent and say: "Oh, it is all very fine to talk about the glories of the age, and to give thanks for the blessings of the past fifty years, but the preacher hasn't mentioned the disgraces of the age, and the deplorable miseries and wickedness which remain for us to mourn."

One thing at a time, I pray you. Put these aside for a moment! Look at the picture I have painted. Say! is it a fairly faithful representation so far as it goes? I think you will own that it is, for I have carefully tried to set down simple facts, and not to exaggerate. Well then, men and women of England! what part or lot have *you*, each one as an individual, in this matter? What have you done, what are you doing, what do you intend to do to increase the glories of the age?—an age of advancement, an age of wider charity, an age of deepened religious feeling; and of more active Church work than has ever been known before! How have you profited, how are you profiting, how do you intend to profit—for your own improvement, for the cultivation of your noblest faculties, for the development of your own higher and spiritual life, by all the many great advantages which you enjoy, and which it is your bounden duty thankfully to use? The servant who knew not his Lord's will and did it not, shall be beaten with few stripes; the servant who knew it and did it not shall be beaten with many stripes. Surely "many stripes" shall be the sternly righteous verdict on those who neglect to do their Lord's will, although they not only know it—as you all know it in this enlightened age—but who have moreover—as you have—every help and assistance affectionately pressed on their notice, which it is possible for the living and awakened Church of the living and life-giving Christ to offer to her members in constant services of prayer and praise, in plain and frank words of exhortation to good works, such as are diligently addressed to you from this pulpit by various preachers, above all in the due and frequent administration of the Sacraments ordained by Christ to be "effectual signs of grace and of God's good-will towards us, by the which He doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

Beloved brethren! let not your rejoicing at the blessings and the glories of the Victorian Age be a farce or a sham! Avail of those blessings yourselves! strive to the utmost of your opportunity and your power to spread those blessings, so that others may enjoy them also, and—believe me—the greatest glory of this, or any other age which shall be glorious in years to come, is a glory which is not transient but eternal, the glory of unaffected goodness adorning men and women with "the white flower of a blameless life," a glory this, which, through the mercy of God and by His assisting grace, the very poorest and meanest of her faithful subjects may share with our much-loved Queen—Victoria the Good!

◆

THE House of Lords has passed through Committee a Bill for amending the Act of 1871 relative to the resignation of incumbents. Under this Act a clergyman who has been the incumbent of a benefice for seven years can obtain a pension, if he retires on the ground that he is "incapacitated by permanent mental or bodily infirmity from the due performance of his duties." This pension is a fixed sum, recoverable as a debt from the new incumbent, irrespective of any diminution from time to time in the income of the benefice. The Bill proposes to make future pensions fluctuate with the averages of the Tithe Commutation Acts. If, however, no part of the income of the benefice is derived from tithe rent-charge or glebe lands, the pension would not be subject to variation. One provision of the Act is that in no case is the pension to exceed a third part of the annual value of the benefice resigned. The Bill would, moreover, prohibit it from being an amount which would not "leave a sufficient income to secure the due performance of the services of the Church according to the scale of stipends" set forth in the Pluralities Act of 1838 for curates to non-resident incumbents. In estimating the value of a benefice for the purpose of the Act certain charges are first deducted. The Bill proposes that these shall in future include terminable mortgages, and also the salary of any curate compulsorily employed. The committee added the salary of a curate where the population exceeds 3,000, or there is more than one church to be served or more than two services on Sunday are usually held. The Duke of Buckingham remarks that "the Commissioners hold themselves obliged, if satisfied with the reasons for resignation, to specify some pension irrespective of the need of the retiring incumbent. Hence nominal pensions down to £1 per annum have been awarded." In its original form the Bill proposed to give Commissioners power to report the expediency of the resignation without specifying any pension at all. In committee, however, this provision was struck out of the Bill.

THE proposed union of the parishes of St Gregory by St. Paul and St. Mary Magdalen, Old Fish-street (the church of which in Knightrider-street was destroyed by fire some time since), with that of St. Martin, Ludgate, has been favourably reported on by the Commissioners who were appointed to consider the subject. The rector of the new benefice is to receive £570 per annum. The site in Knightrider-street is to be sold and, after the payment of expenses, the proceeds are to go towards the erection of a new church somewhere in London.

RHEUMATISM, GOUT,
SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, INDIGESTION, CONSTIPATION, LIVER & KIDNEY COMPLAINTS, NERVOUS DISORDERS, LADIES' AILMENTS, ETC. Promptly Relieved and CURED BY
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT
ALL sufferers should read "Harness' Guide to Health," free by post, containing copies of **Thousands of Testimonials.** Every man and woman in search of **Health, Strength,** and **Energy,** should at once send a **21s.** postal order to the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd. 52, OXFORD ST.** LONDON, W. and procure one of these famous Belts, and they may rely upon being **CURED**
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 9, 1887.

WOMEN AS TEACHERS.

If, as is the fashion with several of our contemporaries in this Jubilee year, a retrospect be taken of scholastic education during the last fifty years, we venture to think that the Head Master of Uppingham School would be found to occupy the chief place as a successful practical reformer in schools of every grade. After obtaining high honours at Cambridge, he began life as a Government Inspector of primary schools, where he transformed the formal, lifeless, impracticable, and irksome instruction into a living, fruitful, and practical reality. His great personal influence and exertions in this direction were assisted by the publication of an admirable English grammar and other truly elementary works—all written in full consciousness of his guiding principle, "that he was dealing with immature baby minds." Then he became the second and greater founder of Uppingham School—a public school which has been second to none in the well-trained and successful scholars that it has turned out during the last thirty years. We have no space to allude to the admirable and useful manuals and addresses that Mr. Thring has published on education.

The work that Edward Thring has accomplished during the past fifty years has been of such immense worth and practical benefit to the country that we are surprised it has not been publicly recognised by the Government. Many a man who has done far less for education and morality has been rewarded by a bishopric or archbishopric. Any Government, in our opinion, would do itself honour by sealing with its approval this most valuable and durable work. But whether with or without the approbation of the Queen, it will be seen from the address in another column that Mr. Thring is steadily pushing forward reforms in our educational system. This last movement for engaging women as teachers is assuredly in accordance with Nature, and has our fullest sympathy and approval. Women are born educators. We commend this address to the very careful consideration of the Clergy and all other teachers. It is to our mind redolent of the most important and practical truths as regards Life, Nature and Education, which ought to be digested and realised by every man and woman who aspires to be a teacher of adults as well as of infants. Many adults owing to "the sublime error," as Mr. Thring calls it, of their teacher in not attempting to deal with them as babies when they actually were so, are left with baby minds. Mr. Thring is one of the few teachers who admit that as a rule morals and intellect depend on health and digestion, consequently he has paid great attention to the physical health of his boys. Inasmuch as in the absence of hereditary disease, which our sanitary legislation (as is nearly the case with the Jews), ought in three or four generations to wipe out, the physical health and stamina of our children is entirely derived from their mothers and nurses. The Head Master of Uppingham is therefore right in saying that "everything is woman's work in which life is highest and force is subordinate," and we believe him to be right in enlisting the service of women as teachers of the young of either sex. We trust the day is not far distant when the experiment will be tried of having female teachers in many of our preparatory schools.

WOMEN AS EDUCATORS.

AN ADDRESS TO THE CONFERENCE OF HEAD-MISTRESSES, HELD AT UPPINGHAM SCHOOL, JUNE 10TH, 1887.

BY EDWARD THRING, M.A., HEAD-MASTER.

EIGHTEEN years ago, on December 21st, 1869, the first school conference, I believe, that was held in England, was held in this schoolroom in which we are now met together. Most certainly the first conference of the higher schools for boys began its existence on that day in this room. It was called together after much searching of heart from a deep conviction that all the skill of the skilled workmen of English schools was truly lying like the seed in the parable, scattered by the wayside for the birds of the air to peck at and devour, and for amateur authority to trample under foot. All lay helpless; there was no defence, no union, no central life that could speak and move. Any risk was better than this. So, with many misgivings, with a very resolute and yet very cowardly heart, that meeting was called together. Between sixty and seventy invitations were sent out, and twelve finally came.

The excuses were various, and a curious study.

How often in my working life have I been reminded of Ovid's line—*Spectatum veniunt, veniunt spectentur ut ipsæ.* For how are the judges judged, especially when inspecting their inferiors, as they think, and dealing out self-satisfied superiority with complacent skill. Well, twelve came; and we can glory at this hour that only twelve came; so big a tree has now grown out of it, and so many branches on every side. I hold it to be a most happy omen that this same room should have the honour of being the first school-room of our public schools for boys to welcome you and your conference to-day. A most happy omen—when I look back and consider what a little seed was sown in December, 1869, and then reflect how different in power and place, how important your assembly is as compared with our weak little life-germ; and I may add in the highest sense truer and better than anything we masters could set on foot. Both because the rough, instrumental work of the world is done by men, whilst the fine and delicate life-power with its influence on life is done by the women; and also because you are fresh and enthusiastic, and comparatively untrammelled, whilst we are weighed down by tradition, cast, like iron, in the rigid moulds of the past, with still heavier chains of modern improvement imposed by present law on our life.

The hope of teaching lies in you. Yours is the power.

It will be well to examine into the nature of power, and see if we can learn how far instrumental force, because every fool can see it, usurps the name.

True power clearly is that essence which at last sets in motion all other things, however long the chain of movement may be before you come to it.

Let a steam engine symbolise force; then the hand which sets the engine in motion is greater than the engine, in spite of the engine being so much stronger; and the intellect that sets the hand in motion is greater than the hand, in spite of the hand being seen to work more; and the choice of good or evil which sets the intellect on to order the hand to set the engine at work is greater than intellect, hand, or engine, which are all its instruments—servants, to do its pleasure.

This truth can be made plain from another side. It is self-evident that nothing which can be taken away from the possessor is the possessor himself. But the steam-engine can be taken away and the hand remains; the hand can be cut off and the intellect remains; the intellect can be marred, by fever for instance, and daily fluctuates with health and digestion, but whether it is damaged or not, active or inert, the choice power remains intact. The love which decides remains; this is the ultimate moving power; this cannot be changed or taken away without destruction of the being. The unprofitable servant in the parable lost his talent, the good had others given, but both the evil and the good remained themselves whatever instrumental powers were given, or taken away.

That power, then, is truest which is least dependent on instrumental force, and yet can set instrumental force in motion best.

There is no question to a thoughtful mind that men are most endowed with instrumental force, and that women most set instrumental force in motion. Of what paramount importance it is then that they should do it in a sober, wise, queenly way, understanding their great mission, neither afraid, nor betraying their sovereignty by mean blandishments, nor trifling with it, but with a calm, grand confidence that it rests with them, when they are trained to know it, and do it, to create a new ideal of manly excellence, and perfect, gentle, pure, unselfish magnanimity in the world, which shall put force in its proper place as a servant of servants, and enthrone the life that moves all things in a tender supremacy of unquestioned right.

Men have tried their hand long enough as the sole teachers, their idolatry of brain-force and glorification of memory-stores, have made but poor work of it. The human being has been left out. The human being must be brought in. I feel a special diffidence as well as a special pride in being allowed by you to-day to address the leaders of England who are making a new start in the history of the world, and have set a movement on foot to introduce a fresh and higher power into national life, and purify the ways of mankind. Men, at all events, have tried long enough, and stuck deep enough in the ruts. The human being has been left out. The human being must be brought in. Somehow he persists in existing in spite of knowledge-shops. There has been a dreary sameness in the perpetual circle of every man and nation elbowing its neighbour out of the way, which we glorify under the name of competition; which, however, has been aptly exemplified in the old heathen downright times, when vice was bold, and spades were spades, by "The priest that slew the slayer, and shall himself be slain." We want something new—life, not human museums. And we have it. For are not we ourselves to-day a sort of parable, and a prophecy? Very few years ago how utterly wild the idea would have appeared of this distinguished company of lady teachers meeting in the great school-room of this public school during term time. What a bit of pictorial teaching this is! How plainly it puts before our eyes the change that has already taken place. It speaks of a new present; it prophecies a still greater coming age; you cannot help seeing how welcome you are; how you honour us by being here, and how we delight to do you honour. I would not strike a discordant note by hinting what would have been the case twenty years ago. Nay, it is no discord. It is the undertone needed to bring out the great contrast, to swell to its rightful fulness the harmony that now is, to lead up to the union that is yet to be between the education of men and the education of women; a true union of two different, but harmonious powers working for the same end, with clear views what that end is, and of the harmonious differences that must combine to produce it. That end is the putting life-power and character above knowledge, heart above head, and making the life-training do this.

Let me lay down some plain propositions.

The first has already been stated, namely, that the instrument is inferior to that which moves it. The steam-engine is inferior to the hand, and the hand-strength inferior to the head-strength, and the head-strength inferior to the love, whether good or evil, that sets it all going. Instrumental power broken loose may be symbolised by the drunken navvy beating the woman he loves.

Secondly, if spiritual influence is the primary power which sets movement going, the sovereign power of women in the world is manifest.

Thirdly, women train the childhood of the world always.

Lastly, as the world advances, every nation in proportion to its advancement gives increased honour to women.

Now these are facts. And facts sooner or later have to be faced.

The eternal facts, I mean, have to be faced, that underlie and ultimately determine all practice, however much for a time practice may upset, ignore, or act against them, and make its own facts, and appeal to them triumphantly as conclusive.

How small a space a generation occupies in the great onward sweep of time; say, a space of a foot measure in a river. How many eddies there are in a great river, that just swing backward their two or three feet or so, and seem to be fixed, the same backward swirl in the same place; but all the time the water flows on, unheeding the permanent eddy and its puny facts. If we were drops of water caught in such an eddy, how hopeless the case might seem! how irresistible the logic of its facts! How many backwaters there are that do actually flow back; a nation, as it were, choosing to rebel against good, but nevertheless the river sweeps it all on in time, its facts and all. Yet how hopeless it would seem to be a drop in a backwater, knowing what was right, but borne along in the opposite direction.

The onward sweep of the river is an eternal fact. The eddy and the backwater are facts of practice. There is no delusion like a temporary fact. The logic of an eddy has everything on its side excepting the knowledge of rivers. And the eddy is close, the world-plan far off, and the eddy facts are triumphantly appealed to as the "spirit of the times," "the irresistible evidence of public opinion," and this or that name, which will at once occur to you, that implies that every one who does not swing with the eddy is a fool. Beware of self-satisfied names—fools are duped by them. Moreover, the eddy at the moment confers honour and profit; the eddy bribes heavily. So it comes to pass that fact-worshippers get to mean those who are infallible on the thing nearest, men who put a guinea on the bridge of their nose, as it were, or have it put there, and never even follow their nose, for they never see to the end of it, but turn round about in obedience to the golden fact planted halfway.

Now no subject in the world has had more eddies, and more eddy facts, dealing with it, than the sovereignty of womanly excellence, and the necessity of casting force from the throne it has usurped, since first Eve put it there in her betrayal of love and good for the sake of knowledge and power. Yet no question has had the great eternal fact of its law of existence put out more plainly in a grand river-like certainty of progress at last, in spite of the permanent eddy of force, and its apparent backward flow.

What eternal fact is more obviously eternal than the significant fact that the first ten years of the life of all mankind pass through the hands of women. Eddy as you please, you cannot eddy out of that.

It is true that force has had it pretty well its own way in public life. This was a certainty in a fallen world, which had fallen through a revolt against gentleness and good.

The great permanent eddy of force supplies the greater part of mankind with their facts. Yet it is but an eddy, and can be seen to be so by any observant eye.

I venture to think that a few words about force will not be out of place.

What is the eternal fact? Are there no tender things in life? Rather, it may be asked, Is not life all tenderness? Tenderness by a multitudinous, quiet, loving, inward determination, creating everything, maintaining everything, ruling everything, ever repairing with delicate prevailing touch the ravages made by force, beautifying the shattered fragments, covering even ruins with a softness as of moss. But the moment force comes in, whether to hearts, or any growths of life, love and life depart. The kingdom of growth knows not force. Force, the rat, is ever gnawing at the root of life. And life is tenderness embodied in ceaseless growth, and prevailing movement. Look at earth's great parable. Look at the grass, the corn, with their everlasting cry of joy, and blessing, and life, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty," Lord and Giver of life, over every inch of ground that lives, and every fruitful field that sustains life. Yet how tender is this omnipotence of living! How tender every blade of grass that clothes the hills with conquest! How tender the slenderness of the grace of the living corn that turns the broad plain into an endless sea of life and life-giving power. What has force to do with the life of grass, or wheat, or any plant, or flower that blows, or tree that spreads in prayer towards heaven? What has force to do with the bird on its nest, or any animal that breathes the breath of life, the wild things that make their home in forest, plain, or river, or sea? Force can kill life, but it cannot give life, no, not to a worm even, or in any way touch life without hurting it. The same truth holds good with man. Force of fighting can kill. Force of law can kill evil and destroy hindrances. But if law goes on, and in its self-righteousness lays its hand on life, it kills life too. Whenever law sets its finger on any portion of the higher life; that life dies; for the simple reason that fixity is the essence of law, and life is movement, and fixity and movement cannot co-exist. Thus law, which is the highest and holiest form of force, becomes an angel of death when it enters the kingdom of life and love.

History might tell us something about force. The early world lived by the sword; and a pretty mess they made of it with their conquests and their plunder. They lived by force on the work of others, on other peoples' lives, that is; they rotted in their own corruption. They were swept away when rotten by another wave of force-worshippers, to be in turn corrupted and swept away, wave following wave of force and corruption, a dreary monotony of successful death in an endless circle.

But when Christ planted His kingdom of life on earth, a life-germ was set in the world as the ruling power, and Force was thrust down from the highest place, and made to serve life, even when it seemed victorious, by scavenger work of sweeping away evil and clearing off rubbish, so as to make room and space for new forms of life. In this way when the life-germ was not strong enough, and failed to master the corrupt Roman Empire with its splendid magnificence of heathen buildings and civilised atrocities, the force powers were let loose, and the strong arms and destroying battle-axes of the Northmen swept temples and civilisation alike out of the world; but even whilst they were doing it a tender undergrowth of spiritual life was rising to replace it. And marvellous heart feeling was astir; and travail pangs, and birth-throes of irrepressible grandeur that found at last life and speech in the strange new language of the great cathedrals, and the order of Christian communities, and glorious buildings for God and man were reclothing earth with unapproachable majesty of heart and mind. Whilst work and wages began to supplant war, and the nobility of labour, that grand gift of Christ to the world at large, was slowly taking the place of triumphant force and the sword as the honourable occupation of men. So at last, after a thousand years, out of the crash and the triumphs of force, and the breakage, the new birth came. Modern Europe was born with all its splendid possibilities, and all its intricate problems of labour and capital, and almsgiving and idleness, and thrift and communism, each to be solved by the generation which through its own or past mismanagement has allowed difficulties to become dangers; or by duty neglected has bred lawlessness and crime.

Nevertheless we have got thus far. Force in the shape of war is not the god of the nations any more.

Work, and wages, and peace, and industry, have taken its place as the aim of manly men.

Now let us pause. This thousand years was on the whole a reign of force. The North-*men* did this bloody work of universal breakage by physical force. Do you envy that murderous onslaught? Would you, in imagination, glory in the thought that North-*women* had fought, and slain, and burnt, and ravaged, and marched through blood and ruin all blood-besmeared, and pitiless, and red with butchery, in their brave, but brutal career of force? Or would you rather choose to be the lovable weakness of holy life, which, by living, holy, though weak, brought a new birth of life into the world, a higher creation, and subdued those barbarous, but gallant, champions of force? O, let the men do the dirty work of the world; leave it to them. Feel no envy for the great scavengers, the glorified destroyers, the scavengers set on to clean out all the refuse peoples, and kingdoms, from the streets of our Jerusalem, and cart off the rotten institutions, and worn-out immoralities with their gauds and glitter; leave it to them. There must be destruction; but it is not enviable work; it is not your work.

This is what history tells us of the first great epoch of Christian life moving, with force making room for it, whilst it destroyed for its own blind ends. So the great river flowed on.

Two thousand years have been spent in this first experience, and now it is over. Another world-era has begun. The drama is to be re-enacted on a larger scale. Another breakage is going on, another irruption of force, and another birth is to come. The weapons are different, but the struggle is the same. The force-powers of the hand smashed up the early world when its glory became its curse and its failure, the force-powers of the head are now to make havoc of civilisations that have failed. Science and intellect, with their railroads, and telegraphs, and steam, are dashing all mankind together in one great fighting mass of forceful, self-glorious, destroying energy, to which nothing is sacred, not even its own pride. And the modern world is to be destroyed, even as the old world was destroyed, and for the same reason, because it has failed to grow with the life, and hardened itself into shapes too narrow for the growing life, and dammed the stream of life back, and forced it to stagnate, and made itself into a prison, and lost its light and its expansion. So it is to perish. It is to be burst up by the foul gases it has generated. A great triumphant breakage by the lust of the head, and the vain-glorious intellect, and the ignorant lawlessness of evil repressed, but not humanised, by the higher power is on foot. The intellect is let loose, and a force, which turns the world upside down, putting its interpretation above the Creation it has to interpret, rating a speck it has studied higher than infinity, valuing its own footnote more than the great volume of the universe, hunting, as it says, for truth, not knowing that truth is, doing at the moment what at the moment is known to be right, strength of life, not strength of brain.—This fighting energy is let loose, and the destroying has begun. And the whole world poured together in one great whirlpool of creeds, habits, idolatries, worships, ignorances, and omnisciences, may need thousands of years before the mud settles, and the great river clears again. The drunken navvy is abroad, law is being paralysed, and he is likely for a time to have it pretty well his own way. But, Oh! leave it to men to do the dirty work of the world, to overthrow for a time in the general crash the beautiful and true old shapes, and to scavenge out of existence for ever the decayed and rotten forms of worn-out decreptitude, that have served their time, or failed.

Force-power of hand or head only touches life to destroy; and yours is the kingdom of life. Search through the world, you will find it true. Force at best is a hewer of wood and drawer of water. Life knows not force, excepting as a servant of servants in a true world.

It is your sovereignty to see this. It is your sovereignty to leave men to do the coarse work, whilst you govern by the unconquerable power of life, and the tenderness of gracious life, whose weakest glance is stronger than all instrumental power, whether of hand or head.

The eternal fact which condenses this truth into a great practical reality is this, Everything is woman's work in which life is highest and force is subordinate.

Both men and women have force-powers, and use them. A woman has arms; a woman has feet. No one, excepting the Chinese, would destroy the feet; and not even the Chinese have yet cut off the arms. But the prize-fighter and the athlete make arms and feet their vocation. The mental prize-fighters and athletes make head and brain-work their vocation. Head-athletics are no better in principle than feet-athletics. But, in denouncing athletics as the highest vocation, no insult is offered to head, or arms, or feet. No counsel is given to cut them off, or to depreciate their living exercise in an excellent way. We do not want the Chinese foot-plan extended and transferred to the head, as Europe has done all too much in the case of its women. Heads *à la* Chinese must be abolished. Women must have thoroughly healthy instrumental power of their own both in head and limb. Life works by instruments; and the civilised man who would prevent women from doing good work is as much a savage as the savage who sleeps or fights, whilst he makes women do the labour he ought to do himself.

Women have to use influence, and, however they are dealt with, do use it. Where is the right influence to come from? It can only come from a right training of body and mind.

Mark what the influence in the first instance is.

The whole world of mankind, for the first ten years of their existence, is sent in a continuous stream through the hands of women. This is the great river rolling seaward. This is an eternal fact, no eddy. The training and moulding of character by women is an eternal fact.

Women are teachers by a law of Nature. This is emphatically woman's work. Character-training, for the child is yet too young to be hammered along in the hack-intellect omnibus. Character-training under sweet influences of home and gentle teaching. Where, then, is this to come from, this power of moulding character?

The answer is, or ought to be, the key to the problem of the life of the world. The data are simple, tender growth in the hands of tender but skilful womanhood.

From this beginning all manhood starts. This is the key to woman's mission. This is the key to the true progress of the world. No eddy can get rid of the onward sweep of this great river.

To form character requires character-power. Character-power requires all good life-knowledge of all real factors of life, combined with the perfection of trained skill.

Perfect life-knowledge requires such a mastery of all instrumental powers of limb and head as is necessary to understand and use them.

Such a mastery demands that women should be trained in limb and head, not as champions of limb and head, but as thoroughly capable in both, so as to be moulders of the character of the world.

This defines accurately the aim and object of all womanly excellence in all things belonging to education.

An eternal fact demands that they shall be educators of the world—heart-educators.

This also points out in how many fields of refined feelings and delicate power in art and literature women will excel men, when fair play is given them' and where they will not do so. Where force is paramount they will not do so. Leave men to do the coarser work. Be content with the queenly life-power that moulds and rules.

There is, however, a good old saying often neglected, that you cannot teach what you do not know. The teachers must first be taught. Who that realises this can fail to rejoice in the great movement of teaching and training now going on, which this Conference so excellently represents. This is a great epoch. I believe it to be the first time in the history of the world that a well-considered course of action has been set on foot by a natural movement of the life itself for training women in general to do their true work in life. Efficiency in life is the question. If efficiency in life is not produced, it will be a heavy blow to the good cause. If, like the Board Schools, life-power is dropped, and a scramble for fragments of knowledge put in its place, the good cause will receive a fatal check.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians; with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary." By C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. London: Longmans, Green & Co. Pp. 344.

It is delightful to get a book so well printed on such good paper as this is; a good book badly printed on cheap, thin paper is like a good joint of meat spoilt in the cooking.

Students have waited a long time for this volume, but they will not be disappointed now that, at last, they have got it. Its method is the same as that of its predecessors; as regards the text, it "has been formed after a wholly independent consideration of the critical material supplied by Tischendorf, and especially by Tregelles"; and as regards the commentary, it is what it professes to be, grammatical and critical. We wish, however, Bishop Ellicott had quoted authorities rather than opinions for the arrangement of his text. No doubt the opinions quoted are better than those of the reader, but Alford's method in our opinion is to be preferred. We like to know the reading of the great MSS., and still more of the most ancient versions, as well as the opinions of the best scholars.

As regards the method of the commentary, we will let Bishop Ellicott speak for himself. "To many," he says, "these pages may seem too full of technical matter, and too persistent in their grammatical references and details. I will ask, however, all who may take this view kindly to remember that this professes to be, and is, a grammatical commentary, and must be borne with as such. Next I will presume to say this, that if the student will patiently wade through these details of grammar, he will be rewarded by a real knowledge of the mind of the original, which so far as I know cannot certainly be acquired any other way. I am well aware that this is a sentiment which may not be quite in harmony with the tone of the hurried days in which we are living, and with the obvious tendency to escape as far as possible the trammels of laborious scholarship. Still, I must be permitted to say it is true."

If the Bishop will allow us to leave out three words, and instead of saying "a real knowledge of the mind of the original," say "a real knowledge of the original," we shall heartily agree. An accurate knowledge of the Greek Testament is going out of fashion in these "hurried days"; new theories about the Bible are constantly propounded by people who have not really read it, yet for all that a knowledge of the text is quite different from a knowledge "of the mind" of the writer.

There are men—St. Paul was one—whose "mind" is not always to be got at by a discussion on the dative case, because St. Paul was an enthusiast, and sentences crack when you attempt to make them hold fiery denunciation, or burning exhortation, like glass in frosty weather. And the perfect commentator—when we get one—knows this, and knows when the dative case matters, and when it does not. Our one grievance against Bishop Ellicott is that he plods steadily on, applying just the same rules and using just the same methods throughout, in the thirteenth and fifteenth chapters just as much as in the seventh. But St. Paul seldom plods; he is in every mood in almost every Epistle, and the true commentator who would interpret St. Paul must enter into his feelings as well as know exactly what he said.

But all this is simply saying that Bishop Ellicott's commentary is only what it professes to be; as such it will be found of the greatest value to the student.

◆

"The Expositor." July, 1887. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Everybody will be glad to read again, and to possess in book form, Dean Church's sermon on "The Idolatry of Civilised Men." And we think also that everybody will feel the bracing effect of Professor Salmon's paper on "The Christian Ministry." "I count," says Professor Salmon, "that the duty on the part of the individual to submit to the settled constitution of the Church is not affected, whatever be the true history of the process by which, in God's providence, the constitution of the Church was established. In any case it is a sin to rend Christ's body by causeless schisms." Professor Salmon has some weighty words for Dr. Hatch, and his "unfortunate speculation" that it was "with special reference to his financial functions that the name bishop was given to the Christian community." "Dr. Hatch has so firmly convinced himself that the word ἐπίσκοπος denotes primarily a financial administrator that he calls it a startling metaphor that God should be called by Ignatius the overseer of all (πατέρα τῶν ὅλων καὶ ἐπίσκοπον). If he had looked into the New Testament I cannot conceive how he could have found finance in St. Peter's description of our Lord (1 Peter iii. 25) as the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls." "Want of sympathy with the subjects of his story is the gravest fault of which a historian can be guilty, and it seems to me that Dr. Hatch has turned his thoughts so exclusively to the secular side of the Christian associations as not to perceive how very subordinate was this aspect of them in the minds of the Christians themselves. It was the hopes and fears of another life which led to the formation of the Christian societies, [and] their officers were honoured, not for their skill in finance, but because they watched for souls as men who must give an account."

Dr. Dods writes of Ezra, whose task it was "to give the Law a commanding place [and] make it the living force which should mould the national life." No doubt Ezra was a hard man, but there are periods in a nation's life when hard men are necessary.

We only say of Canon Cheyne's paper on the "Revised Version of the Book of Psalms," that its author should remember that conjectures are not necessarily right because they are ingenious.

It is an excellent number of the *Expositor.*

◆

UNFORTUNATELY the author's proof of the poem, "The Consecration of the Parthenon," did not come to hand till after last week's PULPIT was printed, and thus a few errors were not rectified. The principal are "Athens" for "Athena's" in the first line; "have" for "has" in first line of the first quatrain; first line of fourth quatrain should be, "To this—to beauty's perfect height;" third line of seventh quatrain, "given" for "give"; tenth line of blank verse "for" should be "far"; third line of next quatrain "death" should have a capital D; "Full" in third line of third quatrain should be "Free": last word of seventh quatrain should be "burn"; second line of ninth, "Creaking" should be "Creating;" in third line of thirteenth, after "his" insert a comma; omit comma after "divine" two lines lower; in last put comma after "Nature" and after "knowledge."

◆

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beechey, Rev. S. Vincent, jun., Rector of St. John's, Waterloo Road, Cheetham; Rural Dean of Cheetham.

Berry, Rev. John H., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Impregnable.*

Blunn, Rev. James H., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Active.*

Boles, Rev. Richard Henry, Vicar of St. Breward, Bodmin.

Browne, Rev. J. H., Curate-in-Charge of St. Andrew's Mission District, Wandsworth; Organising Secretary of the Rochester Diocesan Society.

Buckley, Rev. R. W., D.D., Curate-in-Charge of St. Paul's, Heaton Moor; Curate-in-Charge of the New Mission Church, in the parish of St. Matthews, Brinksway, Stockport.

Clarkson, Rev. John M., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Lion.*

Corbett, Rev. Lionel, M.A., Rector of Hampton Bishop, Hereford.

Dunn, Rev. John Charles, B.A., Vicar of Beadnell, Northumberland; Vicar of Blanchland, Northumberland.

Eayrs, Rev. Joseph, Vicar of Fairfield, Buxton; Chaplain of the Devonshire Hospital, Buxton.

Harington, Rev. James Douglas, M.A., Rector of St. Michael's, Long Stanton, Cambridge.

Harvey, Rev. Frederick, Curate of Frome; Curate-in-Charge of All Saints', Weston-super-Mare.

Johnston, Rev. George Thomson, M.A., Rector of Broughton, Huntingdon.

Murray, Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of Stone, Kent; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester.

Paget, Rev. Henry Luke, Vicar of St. Ives, Hunts; Vicar of St. Pancras.

Paynter, Rev. W. W. Caneborne, Curate of Stratton-on-the Fosse, near Bath, Rector of Christon, Somersetshire.

Peake, Rev. G. E. F., Vicar of Eastover; Rector of Holford, Somersetshire.

Petit, Rev. Paul, M.A., Curate of Manchester Cathedral; Priest-Vicar of Lichfield Cathedral.

Pughe, Rev. Philip Alfred, M.A., Vicar of St. Anne's, Bewdley.

Seaver, Rev. Jonathan, Vicar of Cullercoates; Vicar of St. Mary's, Peckham.

Smyth, Rev. J. B., Chaplain and Naval Instructor at the Royal Marine Depôt at Walmer.

Sproston, Rev. S., Vicar of All Saints', Winterbourne Down, Bristol.

Stanhope, Hon. and Rev. B. L. S., Rector of Byford; Archdeacon of Hereford.

Thompson, Rev. John, Incumbent of Rosslyn Chapel; Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Earl of Rosslyn.

Ward, Rev. John L., Chaplain to the Royal Naval Hospital, Plymouth,

Wilby, Rev. William J., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Carysfort.*

Williams, Rev. J. Hughes, M.A., Assistant Organising Secretary for the Additional Curates' Society (Western District).

◆

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beasley, Rev. Richard Dunkley, M.A., late Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge, and formerly Head Master of Grantham Grammar-school, fourth son of the late T. C. Beasley, Esq., J.P., of Harston, suddenly, while crossing the Furca Pass, Switzerland, on the 24th ult., aged 56.

Bullen, Rev. A. W., Vicar of Great Baddow, at the Vineyards, Great Baddow, on the 29th ult., aged 68.

Croft, Rev. T. C. H., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, at Richmond, Yorkshire, on the 30th ult., aged 56.

Mahon, Rev. J. Vesey, M.A., at the Rectory, Rawmarsh, Rotherham, on the 27th ult., aged 27.

Maturin, Rev. W., D.D., at All Saints', Grangegorman, Dublin, on the 30th ult., aged 82.

Morgan, Rev. G. F., Rector of Teversall, Notts, at Bournemouth, on the 3rd inst., aged 68.

Stevens, Right Reverend William Bacon, M.D., D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Pennsylvania, at the Episcopal Residence, Philadelphia, U.S.A., on St. Barnabas's Day, the 11th ult., in the 72nd year of his age.

The Church of England Pulpit.

ENTHUSIASM.

By the BISHOP OF DERRY.

Sermon Preached at Whitehall Chapel on Sunday, June 19th, 1887.

"NOTHING can be done without a little enthusiasm," was the saying of one who is not ordinarily considered much of an enthusiast—Voltaire. This national festival is a festival of enthusiasm. Let me ask you to consider for a very few minutes that it is a reasonable and a religious enthusiasm—reasonable, or it would not be worthy of a great people; religious, or it would be false to its very name. (1) This is a reasonable enthusiasm. How can this be denied, except by asserting that the glories of the Victorian era are independent of her who gives her name to the era. The men of science who "ascend to axioms," the inventors who descend to works; the historians, prophets of the past; the writers who have added immortal gaiety or immortal pathos to our literature; the fictions that have stung infamies to death, or told some dream of genius petrified by active benevolence into a palace for the people; the statesmen of both parties whose noble conflicts and nobler surrenders have made England what she is; the soldiers who have carried the flag riddled by a storm of bullets; the preachers of the righteousness of God in Christ—these and others are the gift of Him who moulds the man for the age. Their greatness is coincident with, not the effect of, the Victorian era. But surely for the hardest justice the one permanent fact in the changing Governments of fifty years must be credited with something. Look at the map of Europe—I need say no more. One point only I will advert to, because it bears upon the spiritual life of England; for the spiritual is not that which is vaporous and unreal. It is linked with the solid by a thousand connections. Think of the social improvement since 1837. "Fifty years ago," said Mr. Holyoake last week, "the outlook of the industrial classes was dreary as Siberia." Of sixteen millions "with a right to be fed at Nature's board, one million commanded all the seats to which the waiters came with food." The union of the Sovereign was an inestimable blessing in this relation. The Prince Consort saw that apparently outside the range of the dogmatic truths of the Christian creed, yet really in virtue of them, Christianity had the living power of soothing, elevating, ennobling the masses, who were too long looked upon as the disinherited children of modern civilisation. He sowed the seeds that have grown fruitfully into dwelling-houses, parks, gardens for the people. I would gratefully record that his speech at the Mansion House for the Gospel Propagation Society did much for the missionaries of the Cross. If, taking in all elements, the greatest of statisticians can prove that the empire at this moment is five times as great as it was in June, 1837, how much must be due to the superb impartiality of a wise monarch, calling the most capable servants to do their country's work? If social improvement is so marked, how much is to be attributed to the impulse given from the Throne, and become hereditary in the line? From the Throne has come the true progress, which is growth, not pace. The pace of the Gadarene swine must be the fastest upon record in that part of the animal creation to which they belonged. But it was a fatal pace, a pace that killed—for they perished in the waters. The enthusiasm of our Jubilee is a reasonable enthusiasm. A few ravens, indeed, may awake from their baneful tree. A few grumblers may arraign the country, as—

> The weary Titan
> Goes passively by,
> Staggering on to her goal.

"A bad time for a Jubilee when so many classes are suffering." As if all times were not bad times for some. "Democracies are fickle." So profound an observer as Burke thought that a thousand swords would leap from their scabbards to avenge even a look that threatened a Queen of France with insult. But behind that radiant reign was a century of wrong; behind our widowed Queen a century of right. "Loss of national fibre," say others, "inability of patient thought to disintegrate the fine but fatal phrases that disintegrate empires." Let us, then, pray for strength. It is a true prayer that stiffens the fibres of conduct. We were a strong people. We held liberty and peace to be the two greatest of blessings; but if unable to keep both we proclaimed through the wars of years the masculine dogma that liberty without peace is better than peace without liberty. Individual salvation is of grace, national salvation of works. Search and see. The God of whom cometh salvation never saved a nation that was not worth saving. Turn to the 29th Psalm, and join in the words of the patriot King with which it closes. The despot may pray for strength, the craven may pray for peace. Let us pray for both—first strength, then peace. "The Lord shall give strength to His people; the Lord shall bless His people with peace." This reasonable enthusiasm is also (2) a religious enthusiasm. What is the grandest thing in all our Jubilee? Not the canopy of light over London from the illuminations. Not the beacon fires on hundreds of hills. Not the company of Kings. Not the children of England gathered from far lands—the eaglets coming back to the nest in the day of sunshine, who, if the clouds of danger were gathering, would come in their strength upon the wings of every storm. What is the grandest thing? Just this. "The hearth," says an Indian proverb, "is not a stone, but a woman." We have a great home, and its hearth is a royal woman. Since the Castle clock at Windsor chimed three-quarters past ten on December 14th, 1861, and that noble face was covered with the shadows, "until the day break and the shadows flee away," mourning has been around her. It will pass away like a cloud in the passionate sunshine of her people's joy. What is the grandest thing in our Jubilee? No such voice of praise and prayer has ever lifted up the name of any one human being above this earth. To-day the wave begins to form; it is gathering volumes from "the waters, which are nations, and peoples, and multitudes, and tongues." On Tuesday it will stand at equipoise; then curve and fall over with such a storm of music as has never been heard since man began to pray; and then will follow a deep hush, a silence as of half an-hour. First, the strong, majestic tenderness, the enthusiasm of the prayer of a free people, then the depth of silence which it takes thousands of united hearts to make—the prayer and praise which the greatest human master of prayer has marked by one word, not "praise waiteth for Thee," but "for Thee silence is praise, O God, in Sion."

A JUBILEE OF JOY, PRAISE, AND CHARITY.

By the Very Rev. J. C. VAUGHAN, D.D.,
Master of the Temple.

Sermon in the Temple Church on Jubilee and Hospital Sunday, June 19th, 1887.

"It is the Jubilee: it shall be holy unto you."—Lev. xxv. 12.

If the question is asked us, in Scripture phrase, "What mean ye by this service?" the text shall answer for us: "We mean to consecrate the Jubilee. It is the Jubilee: it shall be holy unto you."

The Temple was foremost, a year ago, in consecrating the Jubilee. At midnight on the 19th of June last year the Temple Church was crowded with worshippers, lighted for the first time with the soft bright electric light, filled with the stirring music of the Coronation anthem, solemnised by the voice of prayer for the Queen and the Royal House—that so we might usher in with loyal devotion that year of England's Jubilee, on the latest day of which we are now once again assembled in this glorious Midsummer sunshine.

It is a heavy responsibility to be charged with the office of striking the sacred keynote of the Jubilee. Fewest words will be fittest, simplest thoughts will be most becoming, on a day when all that could be spoken is already present in these hearts waiting only for the touching of the chord to which all are ready to vibrate.

This great celebration has (I think) three chief things in it.

1. The word itself shall suggest the first of them. The derivation of "Jubilee" has been perplexed, they say, from earliest times—we might presume to think needlessly—by lexicographers and philologists. It is probable that its root lies in a sound as of many waters; that prolonged and repeated flood-voice which is the very soul of melody. The word occurs in the description of the solemnities of the great law-giving on Mount Sinai, long before the institution of the festival which bears its name. "When the trumpet soundeth long" is literally "in the Jubilee of the trumpet." The same word is found in the animated description of the siege of Jericho—again expressing apparently a sound of peculiar and prolonged impressiveness—the "Jubilee of the trumpet." This, at all events, is certain, that Jubilee is a word of joy. The Latin word formed from it has caught its sense; *iubilate* means "be joyful," and the first thought of a Jubilee is a thought of joy.

Joy is one of the fruits of the Spirit. It is also one of the precepts of the Gospel. Debased and distorted Gospels bewray themselves by the loss of it. The Puritan tried to part with it, and in doing so made religion odious to the young, impossible for the happy.

Nothing strikes us more in the Old Testament than the joyousness of its inspired psalmody. Every possible form of expressing joy is exemplified in the Bible. "David danced before the Lord with all his might, girded with a linen ephod." "Praise Him with the timbrel and dance; praise Him with stringed instruments and organs."

Let no man say, I cannot rejoice at will. There is education in these things. Let no man say, I cannot rejoice to-day because to-morrow I must weep. Between this holy Sunday and that magnificent Tuesday there will be a Monday of funerals. Hearts will be lacerated, homes will be desolated. We ourselves shall be following to the grave a man loved and honoured in his generation—manly and courageous, useful and laborious, a diligent servant of the State, the intended biographer of Arthur Stanley. "There is a time to laugh and a time to weep." In this complicated world the alternations are sudden. But no heart is right with God which is monopolised by either.

Joy may even strengthen for sorrow. Certainly Christian joy does. "The joy of the Lord is your strength." Even dull lives, and gloomy lives, and sorrowful lives are helped, not harmed, by brief vicissitudes of enjoyment. Those children that play in your gardens may come from squalid and hungry homes, and go back to them; are those evening hours of merry forgetfulness therefore injurious or valueless? Or does that "day in the country," which is one of the many Christian inventions of our generation, go for nothing to the life's life of the overwrought Londoner, young or old, man or woman, for whom it breaks the monotony of being, and says this at least to the weary wayfarer of this wilderness, "Man, and therefore God, careth for thee"?

What if an easy ingenuity of self-tormenting should say to us who are keeping this Jubilee, It is levity, it is hypocrisy, it is cruelty, to forget the mass of sin and suffering that surrounds you, and surrender yourself for one week or for one day to dreams of optimism, as enervating as they are delusive? How shall we answer? May we not say this?—We are as concious as any men of the terrible evils which surround us. We are as far as any men from ignoring either the war of unbelief and ungodliness against our Christianity, or the machinations of disloyalty and treachery against our empire. But we consider it a positive duty now and then to look away from all else to the bright side of things—to estimate justly the advantages which counterbalance our anxieties—were it only to keep ourselves from sinking into that whining and querulous tone of speaking and thinking which we feel to be not more ungrateful, not more unmanly, than it is enfeebling and paralysing.

And we think that this Jubilee is an opportunity for doing so. We are resolved and determined that it shall have joy in it—first, midst, and last. We find it helpful in this aspect. We would inquire of those who can see nothing but gloom in the present situation whether they can honestly wish themselves in any earlier century, or in any earlier year of this century, rather than in this nineteenth age and this eighty-seventh year of it. We would assist them in answering the question by trying to place them in imagination in the year of the last royal Jubilee—celebrated, in that instance, at the opening, not the close, of the fiftieth year of the reign. We cannot think that on reflection they would prefer the year 1809 to the year 1887 as a life-residence. What was the condition of England, at home and abroad, in Church or in State, in the year 1809? Was the Church then wider awake than now? Was the hold of the Church upon the people, whether estimated by attendance upon its worship, or by devotion to its interests, or by liberality to its Missions, or by generosity to its institutions, educational, philanthropic, or directly religious, to be compared with that which is now? Or let them look abroad. It was a time of war. It was not a time (like that which came afterwards) of successful, of victorious war. The year 1809 was the year of the retreat to Corunna—the year of the chivalrous death (yet scarcely in the arms of victory) of Sir John Moore—immortalised in the sweetest dirge of English song by the young Irishman in his Dublin college, soon to be transported by a premature consumption to the heaven for which his obscure Irish curacy prepared him. It was a gloomy and a sorrowful England upon which the year 1809 closed. The dogged hardihood of the Peninsular War was scarce yet girt for the struggle. Waterloo was still in distant perspective. The year 1809 was the eve of the old King's last decade—that pathetic death of the Princess issuing for the royal father in ten years of darkness, blindness, and madness.

Shall we not, were it but by contrast, joy in the Jubilee of 1887?

We dwell not here on marvellous miraculous "leaps and bounds" of progress—progress material, sanitary, scientific. These things go without the saying. These things want not their *vates sacer.* All places of concourse ring with them.

We miss to-day a gracious and kindly presence which we had once hoped for. But the very absence makes that possible which else had been precluded. We cannot forget that this Jubilee is the Jubilee of a reign. It has a personal meaning. We cannot dissociate the reign from a person. And the Bible bids us not to be ashamed to name the Royal name even in God's temple.

For fifty years we have been habituated to that which at first was so strange to us—the title of Queen. It seems now to us as though it was the natural thing—wedding chivalry to loyalty, and enlisting every instinct of the man on the side of the allegiance of the subject.

But if the title has been something, may we not say here, amongst ourselves, the studious secluded Templars, that the character has been more? To say but the two words—a pure Court, a constitutional Sovereign—is is not to give reason enough why this Jubilee should be jubilant?

Yes, we have had a human, a very human Sovereign. This has been characteristic. This it is which has differenced the reign itself from almost any other reign in history. We have been made to look upon the Sovereign in that light which the great orator described as turned by the vulgar revolutionists of his day into a disparagement. "In their eyes," he said, "a Queen is but a woman." We say, and make it the brightest gem in the diadem, "The Queen is a woman."

Yes, and therefore she has been respected before she asked to be obeyed. Respected, admired, revered, loved—such has been the order. And when we had gone thus far it scarcely needed to be added that her popularity has been wonderful, wonderful in days when the home was still bright and therefore the Court brilliant; wonderful surely still more now, when the comparative seclusion adds sympathy to the other claims of loyalty, and when the reappearance, if it be at intervals, if it be sometimes long waited for, evokes a burst of enthusiasm only heightened and accentuated by a something of surprise.

I check myself, for I think I have said enough to justify the saying that the Jubilee of 1887 is first and foremost a Jubilee of joy.

2. I must coerce within narrowest limits the second characteristic—it is a Jubilee of praise.

Joy is not praise. There might be a joy as irreligious as it was selfish. There might be a Jubilee of such joy.

And I would not deal harshly with it. I would hail the joy (in any form that was not wicked) of the Jubilee.

But I would lift it higher. The Jubilee of the text was a religious Jubilee. The text itself bids the people make it holy.

The slightest touch must suffice.

The trumpet of the Levitical Jubilee sounded on a marked day. That most solemn day of all the year to the Israelite, on which a typical atonement was made for the sins of the priest and for the sins of the people, was crowned, towards evening, by the sounding of the Jubilee trumpet—as though to associate for ever the thought of joy with the thought of forgiveness—without which last good were it for each of us if he had not been born.

We would consecrate our Jubilee. We would hear its trumpet sound on the day of Atonement. We would make it say to us, Joy dissociated from the Giver is but half joy. Have any of you listened to the Agnostic, who says, "There is no God. At least I know not any?" Have any of you caught the idle talk of the day, which says, Souls born religious may be left so, but sensible men have long regarded development, natural and orderly, as the only certain law of being; to suppose God ruling nations, or interposing in lives, or making one generation to differ from another, is a nursery fable, absurd where it is not mischievous? For you, I admit, while you are thus, Jubilee joy cannot pass into Jubilee praise—you must be unmade and remade before it can be so.

Yet suffer *us* to hallow our Jubilee in the House of God. We would bless and praise God for His dealing with this England. We would ascribe to His Name and His Word the fact that this throne has stood while other thrones have tottered—that this one Constitution, alone of the Constitutions of Europe, has been found capable of combining liberty with order, adaptability with permanence, versatility of practice with tenacity of principle. We believe that it is to the faith of England in the Bible, to the freedom of individual consciences to worship God in spirit, to the long habit of family love, to the deep-down religiousness of the homes of her people, and the instinct of independence of all save One—qualities which hold directly of Him and fear neither man nor devil besides—that we have in this moment of looking before and after—and therefore that we can say, in no spirit of pride and in no spirit of fanaticism, but in the spirit of unfeigned self-renunciation, not 'I am rich and have need of nothing,' but 'Hitherto the Lord hath helped us.'

3. The Jubilee of joy and the Jubilee of praise is in the third and last place a Jubilee of charity.

Yes, I will hope it in the best and highest of senses. I am sure that that charity which is Christian love has thrived and grown apace during this last long half century. What phenomena of Christian inventiveness, in the form of care for want, woe, and wrong of all kinds—what prodigies of self-devotion to the cause of God and man—what sacrifices of ease, home, and life, for country, for humanity, for the Gospel — what martyrdoms, sudden and lingering—what endurances of solitude, of self-effacement, of obloquy for conscience' sake—have marked the period over which the eye roves to-day! Martyr soldiers, martyr explorers, martyr nurses, martyr Bishops—can I not almost add, martyr statesmen?—loving not their lives unto the death, might they but honour Christ and lift mankind.

And may we not say that charity, in its more level sense of mutual forbearance, kindly understanding, generous tolerance, keeps its Jubilee also to-day? I know it is an ill time to choose for such glorying, in some places and aspects. Yet are there not gracious and noble examples, even amidst the sharpest provocations and exasperations of political life, of a self-control, even to serenity and sweetness, beautiful in the sight of God and man. In a different sphere of life, that of religion and the Church, is there not an approximation of party to party, or, if this be not yet, still a willingness to bear and to forbear, to make the least of differences, and to impute the best of motives, noticeable as new, noticeable as progressive? As between Churchmen and Churchmen, we hope it—as between the Church and the Churches, we do not despair.

We take yet a third, perhaps the least distinctive, of the workings of charity, when we remind you that this is not only Jubilee but Hospital Sunday, and that it makes an earnest appeal as such to charity in the sense of almsgiving.

To plead the cause of hospitals is happily needless in any form but that of gentlest persuasion. Arguments may be urged, by good sense or by selfishness, against some lines and directions of giving. Neither good sense nor yet selfishness can say a word against this. To give to the disabled father, wife, or son the best help towards recovery from sickness, and at the same moment to give to medical science its best help alike towards the diagnosis of diseases and towards the discovery of remedies, admits of but one reception in hearts that are human and intellects that are intelligent—the only difficulty is to quicken anything like a corresponding sense of the magnitude and the urgency of the work.

We have read during these last days that, although 2,000 beds are vacant in our hospitals for lack of funds (alas! not of cases) to keep them occupied, still the expenditure of these merciful institutions has exceeded the income by £100,000. This last, then, is the expression in figures of the demand made upon us to day. To maintain these hospitals, even with 2,000 sorrowful vacancies in them, the sum of £100,000 beyond the amount of their subscription lists is asked of the bounty of London to-day.

You say it is hopeless—idle to expect, impertinent to suggest it. We pride ourselves upon the amount given in this church on previous Hospital Sundays—an average perhaps of £200 on fourteen occasions. Once in the year, once only, we are here asked to give. I trust and believe and know that this is not the sum total of the charitable giving of many. Still it does seem as if a dole of five shillings apiece did not, could not, represent the capability, the easy capability, of a congregation like this.

What shall I say? How shall I plead with you? I know that giving is a science as well as a grace—and in either form to be acquired only in the school of Jesus Christ. Even Christians do not all learn it—it needs a favourable circumstance as much in the teacher as in the taught.

To-day we will not doubt. The Jubilee of joy and the Jubilee of praise shall not lack the third link in the chain—the Jubilee of charity. Yet how much rather would we that a more powerful and a more durable motive might enter one or two of those hearts! "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ"—rich in the sovereignty of countless worlds—for our sakes poor. Surely, after this, we can understand Him when He says, "It is more blessed to give than to receive"—more blessed, because more like *Him*.

◆

THE annual exhibition of ecclesiastical art will be held at Wolverhampton during the Church Congress, by permission of the corporation, in the Art Schools, which are within easy reach of the Congress Hall. Most of the leading Church furnishers, embroiderers, silversmiths, and glass-painters will be represented, and educational works and appliances will also be included in the exhibition. The loans will embrace goldsmiths' and silversmiths' work, ancient and modern, and ecclesiastical metal work in general, embroidery, needlework, tapestry, wood and ivory carving, ecclesiastical furniture, paintings, drawings, architectural designs for churches and schools, photographs, books, and MSS., and other objects of archæological interest belonging to the churches of the diocese. The collection of disused communion plate is always a special feature of the exhibition. As in former years, a portion of the building will be set aside for Church societies and their publications, accommodation being provided for the secretary or representative, who will be there to give information to those requiring it.

RHEUMATISM, GOUT,
SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, INDIGESTION, CONSTIPATION, LIVER & KIDNEY COMPLAINTS, NERVOUS DISORDERS, LADIES' AILMENTS, ETC. Promptly Relieved and CURED BY
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT
ALL sufferers should read "Harness' Guide to Health," free by post, containing copies of **Thousands of Testimonials.** Every man and woman in search of **Health, Strength, and Energy,** should at once send a **21s.** postal order to the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd. 52, OXFORD ST.** LONDON, W. and procure one of these famous Belts, and they may rely upon being CURED
[illegible] of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 16, 1887.

RURAL NONCONFORMITY.

THERE has been a good deal of correspondence on this subject, in the columns of one of the leading Church newspapers, and many and various reasons have been assigned as to the cause of it. The General Election of 1885 revealed the fact that in the rural districts the labourers were hostile to Conservatism, and therefore it was judged that they were also opposed to the Church; as if the two *must* of necessity go hand in hand. But we believe that many voted for the Radical candidates, because they had heard the clap-trap and the specious promises which had been made to them by political agitators; but that they were really opposed to the Church by no means follows.

But what are the reasons why Nonconformity has grown so rapidly as some seem to think that it has done? In the first place, difference must be noted between the various parts of the country; for instance, it is a great deal stronger in Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, and Derbyshire, than it is in the South of England, say Hampshire and Sussex. The reason is this: In the North, trade has grown rapidly within the last fifty years, and what were villages in former days have now assumed the appearance of towns, or, at any rate, are large, over-grown places—a medley between the one and the other. The village green may be there, with its Church and school; but beyond the confines of the old village, there will be seen rows of cottages, and they have overgrown the church accommodation; and in consequence of our apathy, and not rising to meet the exigencies of the case, by providing mission rooms, etc., Nonconformity has stepped in, and by means of building chapels, and Sunday schools, has gathered in large congregations. Whereas in the South, things are very much as they were, and so Dissent has not gained the hold that it has in other places. Further, we must bear in mind, that the temperament of the people has had a considerable part to bear in this work. Anyone who knows the North of England, will notice the heartiness with which people enter into things, and it may be that the hearty singing of the Dissenting chapel, and the enthusiastic, oftentimes vociferous extempore preaching, has drawn away many; the same may be said of Cornwall and other places.

And in addition to all this, we think that in many places the Church has not been sufficiently elastic, both in the arrangement of the services, and also in the persons of her clergy. We would urge the old plea for as much breadth in the services as possible, and a little less of the rigid formality with which the services are oftentimes conducted, avoiding on the other hand irreverence and slovenliness; and then we think the sermons might be made more suitable to the people's understanding, and not so stilted as they often are. Speaking of this matter, we are reminded of the story of Bishop Blomfield, who preached a most learned sermon to a village audience, proving, as he thought, the being and existence of a God; and of his surprise to find on inquiry from one of the labourers that after all, that he (the preacher) had affirmed, that the labourer still thought there *must* be a God—his idea being that the sermon had explained *away* the being and existence of a God.

In dealing with simple rural folk, we *must* if we would gain their ear and attention, preach to them in a language "understanded of the people," not using vulgar phrases, but by being as simple as possible. There is no doubt that Nonconformity has gained by the use of free, and what may seem to us unconventional, sermons. And there has been, moreover, a wonderful amount of the social element—the use of lay power; for where would Wesleyanism have been without its "local preachers" Chapel Steward, Class Meetings, &c., and Congregationalism without its deacons?

We believe that another cause why rural Nonconformity has gained ground, may be found in many cases in the stiffness of some of the clergy. A vicar or rector has in his benefice a freehold; he cannot be dismissed from his cure unless for some grave offence, in order to prove which, the elaborate machinery of the ecclesiastical Courts, has to be set in force, often at very great expense. And this feeling of security, has sometimes enabled him to assume an air of superiority above his parishioners, and his will must be law. *Sic volo, sic jubeo*, is his motto, and where there has been opposition to this will and wish, there has arisen ill-feeling and disruption, and Dissent has profited by it. We know of several cases where this has been done, with the result either of success to the Dissenting chapel, or that people have lapsed into utter indifference. We want more of the principle of "give and take." True, country folk reason according to the light that is in them, which to the educated mind may be obscure darkness; but then it is possible to *lead* where it is impossible to drive, and the clergy are not to be "lords over God's heritage," but "to be gentle unto all men." And we believe that if there were more of the spirit of conciliation, the more the Church would gain.

So also it is no use "preaching at" or railing against Dissent; that it exists we all know. The best thing is to try and show in how many things we agree; to minimise as far as possible the differences, and yet at the same time not to compromise our own principles. They went out from us, at a time when the Church was dull and dead, and when spiritual lethargy reigned supreme. Now that there is vitality and renewed life, let us try to win them back. The statement made by the Bishop of Llandaff at the annual Church Defence meeting, was very cheering, especially when he stated that at a recent confirmation, out of 114 candidates, seventy had been Nonconformists. And in the Jubilee services which have been held, we hear of Dissenting ministers reading the lessons in church. Such action may pave the way for home reunion.

That there has been cause for rural Nonconformity no one will deny. May those causes be removed, and may the Church grow stronger in the affections of the people, should be the wish and prayer of every true loyal Churchman.

TWO PORTRAITS BY A HOME-RULER.

A SERIES of biographical sketches of eminent politicians and literary men was published at New York in 1872, under the title of "Modern Leaders." From the title-page, its author appears to have been Mr. Justin McCarthy. The book has never been reprinted in England, we believe; and the picture it gives of those two old friends and fellow-workers, Messrs. Gladstone and Bright, are worth glancing at just now, when those leaders are fighting in hostile camps.

Mr. McCarthy protests against Mr. Gladstone's claims to greatness in character, in intellect, in statesmanship, in oratory, in "light and leading." He declares that he has no force of intellect. Force of intellect, he contends, is accompanied by decision. Its possessor settles questions in his own mind; he "sees and accepts what the human limitations of thinking are, recognises the necessity of being done with mere thinking about it, and so decides and is free to act." Mr. McCarthy detects and is disgusted with the intellectual weakness betrayed in Mr. Gladstone's "interminable consideration and reconsideration, qualification and requalification, of every subject and branch of a subject."

After that, it was perhaps unnecessary for Mr. McCarthy to express his disbelief that the subject of his sketch could ever show himself a great statesman, or comparable with such men as Chatham, Washington, Cavour, or Bismarck. A great statesman is "tested by a great crisis, and is greatest at a crisis." Mr. Gladstone if so tested would, he thinks, fail ignominiously. That politician is declared to be a "brilliant orator, but not a great orator." Straightforward eloquence, "cleaving its way like an arrow," is essential to this. And Mr. Gladstone is not straightforward. "He goes round and round a subject, turning it up to the light, now this way, now that." He is "a complete embodiment of Lord Macaulay's Halifax;" but "some of Disraeli's speeches have been more effective and triumphant than anything ever spoken by his present rival."

As to leadership, this writer is lost in wonder that "such a man ever came to be the successful leader of a great party at all." Admirers of Mr. Disraeli "are usually devotees of the man himself." But the author of "Modern Leaders" has heard very few of his (Gladstone's) followers ever express any personal affection for him. "It is quite notorious in London that some of his adherents can hardly control their dislike of him." And Mr. McCarthy refers to the outburst of Mr. Grant Duff, when he charged Mr. Gladstone with the trick of suddenly "turning round and firing his revolver in the face of his followers." The absence of personal liking amongst Mr. Gladstone's followers is attributed to their repeated disappointments in him. He is "modest." "There is nothing ungenial in his manner or his temper." But the truth is that "people cannot rely upon him, or think they cannot, which so far as they are concerned amounts to the same thing." The causes of Mr. Gladstone's shiftiness of character, Mr. McCarthy resolves into three. First, there is a morbidly sensitive conscience, which "can hardly ever find any cause or deed smooth enough to be wholly satisfactory." To this is joined an eloquence which "flows literally away with him." But most powerful of all is "a strong, genuine, unmingled delight in mere argument—perhaps as barren a delight as human intellect can yield to." This passion for argumentation in Mr. Gladstone Mr. McCarthy declares to be "stronger than his love of figures, or of Homer, or even of liberty. He is always ready to sacrifice his friend, or his party, or even his cause, to his argument." Despite all this, Mr. Gladstone is described by the most cultured member of the Irish Parliamentary party as having "his whole nature under the influence of æstheticism, or what is commonly called 'sentiment.' . . . If the Laocoon had been the work of a New England artist, I think the North would have found a warm advocate in Mr. Gladstone," instead of having "the celebrated panegyric on Jefferson Davis" hurled in its face. As one memorable instance of the lengths to which this deplorable passion for argument has led the present leader of the English Home Rulers, Mr. McCarthy points to that gentleman's conduct when the case of the three Fenians convicted of having murdered the police-sergeant at Manchester was brought before Parliament. A legal point in favour of the prisoners was raised in the House of Commons. The Conservative Government, taken by surprise, was unable to meet it. But Mr. Gladstone most ignobly came to that Government's aid. Unable to resist the goadings of his master passion, he started up, "pulled the Tory law officers out of their difficulty, and upset the case for the Fenians." At this Mr. Gladstone's Irish friends were, of course, most savagely and most virtuously indignant. His English followers, too, according to Mr. McCarthy, thought he "might have left the Tories to hang their own political prisoners." To these exasperating causes of disgust and mistrust might be added (if it is not included in the "qualifition and requalification," etc.), Mr. Gladstone's mania for interminable hair-splitting explanations of his views, whatever those views happen to be, for the time being. When Garibaldi visited England it was commonly believed that he came hither to get an English wife. "But Garibaldi has got a wife already!" exclaimed somebody in the presence of Lord Palmerston. "That's not of the least consequence," remarked his lordship. "We will send Gladstone, and he will explain it away!"

Glancing over Mr. Gladstone's political career up to 1872, Mr. McCarthy declares that he would "despair of the triumph of that (the Liberal) party for the present generation if there were not stronger and simpler minds behind his to keep him in the right way, to drive him on, and, above all, to prevent him from recoiling after he has made an effective stride forward." In view of this conclusion it is amusing just now to note Mr. Gladstone's case at present. Determined for the moment to "go the whole hog" and hand over Ireland to the Parnellites, he has such "stronger and simpler minds" as those of Mr. Parnell, Mr. Healy, and Mr. Sexton close behind him, keeping him straight in the way he should go, urging him on now and then, but always ready for some recoil; and behind these gentlemen the still "simpler and stronger" minds of certain well-known patriots in the United States, with their own means of urging on and preventing recoil.

In strong contrast to Mr. McCarthy's estimate of Mr. Gladstone is his account of Mr. Bright. Deep political insight, simplicity, and straight-forwardness are declared to be the latter politician's distinguishing characteristics. By simplicity Mr. McCarthy means that the great Quaker is free from "the influence of complex emotions"; that he possesses a power of recognising at once the distinctions between essentials and non-essentials, "the true end and the way to it," and "an accurate appreciation of political perspective." Given any subject, political or economical, and "time to think over it, and Mr. Bright's judgment on that subject would be sure to be right." "He is gifted beyond any Englishman now living with the rare and admirable faculty of seeing right into the heart of a subject, and discerning what it means and what it is worth." Mr. Bright's judgment, according to the political artist who here sketches him, is never "a lucky jump at a conclusion." Some new policy is broached in the House of Commons, and Bright sits silent and listens. Friends gather round him for his opinion. "Wait till to-morrow, and I will tell you," is his rejoinder, and "to-morrow's judgment is certain to be right. I can remember no great public question coming up in England for the past dozen years in regard to which Mr. Bright's deliberate judgment did not prove itself to be just." And yet we suppose Mr. McCarthy regards with indignation Mr. Bright's "deliberate judgment" on the Union question and the intimate relations between "Parnellism and Crime." However, he has the other one, the shifty no-statesman on his side.—*St. James's Gazette.*

WOMEN AS EDUCATORS.

An Address to the Conference of Head-Mistresses, held at Uppingham School, June 10th, 1887.

By EDWARD THRING, M.A., Head-master.

(*Continued from page* 23.)

Character moulding, or, in other words, the creaion of power that rules the world of instrumental force, will always be your main work. There you are queens supreme, and it is the supreme work of the world. It is your grand privilege to make goodness lovely and lovable, and by your very presence to diffuse a kind of sacred atmosphere wherever you move if you are true to your high mission, which is to show to all the world the omnipotence of the weakness of beauty, when beauty means, as it ought to mean, the purest thought and feeling in its truest shape. This is Christianity. "Whatsoever things are lovely, think of these things." This is Christianity. The Crucifixion has set in letters of light and flame on all creation the glorious truth, that a weakness which dies at the hand of force because it is good is immortality and life, triumphant by its own inward power of life, is divine, is of God, is God with us.

You who are weak in force-power have to prove this as teachers. And as teachers you will want all the strength of heart that religion can give when your weakness is matched against the trials of life. It matters comparatively little what knowledge is taught. Who are the teachers? is the real question. What the teacher is, and how the teaching is done, that is all in all. I do not understand how anyone can keep fresh as a teacher, when the first enthusiasm has worn off, excepting from a feeling of doing work for Christ; neither do I understand what knowledge is to do to make better lives, unless it is guided by religion. Nero was a very accomplished man. And we need not go back to Nero for examples of men whose splendid knowledge and ready tongues have only made them more consummate evil-doers, and more elaborate artificers of pernicious delusions and ambitious falsehoods. Not what is taught so much as the spirit in which it is taught makes the difference; above all, the character of the teacher. True teachers cannot be knowledge-hacks. Set hacks to drag a knowledge omnibus, and farewell to teachers. And you—you, the moulders of character—how can you mould character without the one great character-power? Lives are committed to you, not heads, not animated steam engines, or intellectual navvies. You have to justify this great new movement by the efficiency of the lives you train. It is now certain that this great movement cannot be crushed. So far success is assured. But very jealous eyes watch its progress, and are looking at its outcome. You have to justify the movement in every English home by increased efficiency in home life. All new movements are criticised, that is but the common lot. Never fear that. All new movements are open to criticism, there must be mistakes, never be discouraged by that, pathfinders of necessity get a little mud. It is very possible to be too clean. Shame on the pioneer whom his tailor would praise. Moreover, ages of experience under the force-idolatry of men have not made things so delightful that you need be afraid. If education means making the most of each and all, and giving to every one a fair chance, simply it does not exist. How many minds of the young are mere lumber rooms, small, untidy, with nothing in them but dirty bits of old finery and a few blunt tools. How many distinguished individuals are nothing more than second-hand bookshelves vilely disarranged. Others again are just dust-bins full of sweepings of police reports, yellow-backs, Latin grammar leaves, broken ink bottles, and other rubbish. And worst of all are those non-human manufactures, the opposite to Chinese feet, the big heads, the human bull-dogs, all skull and jaw, those bodiless heads with their squirmy, shrunken carcases from which all feeling and sympathy have been dried out, those dwarfs, who know everything except human life and practice, those chemical alembics of distilled books, those automaton rulers of a world which unhappily is alive. How can they and the system which glorifies them cavil if a few women do turn out unpractical. Defend us from the goggle-eyed giant-headed dwarfs with their shrivelled anatomies, male or female say I. Knowledge set above feeling has cursed the world long enough.

Let us, then, be content to make sure of a great cause, and be regardless of criticism, true or false, excepting so far as we can learn from it.

You have to mould character from babyhood onwards. Bear in mind every untaught, untrained mind is a baby mind; and even Newton began by being a baby. Here in my judgment lies the great sin of men as teachers. They will persist in shutting their eyes to the real work they have to do, namely teach immature baby minds because some few, on whom they have bestowed extra pains, are not babies. So they leave them babies still, as they have not attempted to do anything with them as they actually are. Avoid this sublime error.

The air is full of aërial disquisitions and philosophic terms. Big words have a peculiar charm for non-thinkers and half-thinkers. The blessed word "Mesopotamia" will never die out of schools. The philosophy may be all true, very gospel in its way, but nevertheless (it may be my misfortune) almost all that I have heard or read of it belongs to another world from our child world; and is much the same as the birds of the air dealing with the fishes of the sea, and has no more to do with baby mind than an eagle with a mollusc. We do not claim to pass judgment on the flight of eagles or demonstrate the laws of wings, but we do try to be authorities as to how to teach the average mind; we do try to understand the simple processes by which baby mind is given healthy growth and to make it grow. Let us fix our hearts on the baby mind, the immature growing young creature, the average child, boy or girl; do that, and I will venture to say you will never lose sight of your great function of moulding the character of the world. You will never forget that the young world, all of it, passes through your hands always.

There is another eternal fact equally unforgetable when once seen, the eternal fact of helpfulness, which is yours. The divine privilege of being helpers. Woman was created to help, to make good, that is, the deficiencies of the world of man, to come in in times of strain and trial to relieve and cheer, to take, as it were, on themselves the part of angels on earth, ministering spirits, good Samaritans to succour the wounded, standing somewhat apart from the fray to bring hope and kindly gentle support, in a word, "helps meet for man." And here again we meet the double truth which has attended us all along, of a higher and more sovereign influence committed to your hands, and of true working power; the truth which this Conference embodies of trained working skill. For how can they help, who know not how to work. We meet again the truth which has accompanied us from the beginning, that man in no mean spirit is intended to do the rough work of the world, while it is the divine mission of women to follow on his work, to put the finishing touches, to help and bind up, and soothe, and cheer, and throw a halo of gentler life round this hard, warring, daily contest of good and evil struggling and toiling in their pain. Work-power is wanted. You are busy in giving it, but it is helpful work-power, not destroying, gentle work-power not forceful.

This once more fixes definitely woman's domain. Woman is a fellow-worker with man in an harmonious but independent sphere; man, the rough shaper and fighter: woman, the helper, healer, and queen of the inner life. These two, character-moulding and helpfulness, condense all that can be said upon the subject. No one can go wrong who is loyal to these two. Remember, out of this comes also the truth that it is your special business to make goodness lovable, it is your business to be lovely in mind and body. Force is not lovely, not lovable; the moment force is allowed to assert itself in a character, it destroys love. The old golden-mouthed preacher, St. Chrysostom, gave utterance to a sentence, which is perhaps the greatest practical truth in earth and heaven, that ever came from lips not directly inspired, when he said, "Those who love prefer obeying to commanding." Prefer it. How gladly when we love do we long with unutterable yearning to do some service, some act of obedience, some devoted deed, which shall show the love, and prove it by laying down before the feet of the beloved all things, even life itself. Thus a true world would be inhabited by beings earnestly striving to do all the most laborious or painful duties for one another with a glad alacrity, the highest striving most. And it is a marvellous thing that such an unselfish fire divine should be found burning in this low world of force-idolaters; marvellous, that womanhood by its very presence should make the strong stoop, and the proud lay aside their armour, and bow even the lowest of the low before this altar fire of God. And quite apart from what is called love, a noble woman, like a star, radiates pure light round her as she moves, and the basest even, all unconsciously draw healthier breath; and evil thoughts, and evil words, and evil deeds slink away, and feel some perception of brighter things.

This great unconscious faculty of scattering light, leads up to the last summit and crown of earthly life, the final revelation waiting—waiting patiently, all ready to spring into living life whenever earth has been purged enough to let it live, that grand revelation, that all life on earth, men and women alike, is to be cleansed and glorified into the supreme excellence of womanly perfection, and that glorified humanity is the Bride of Christ.

And here I close, though much needs to be said, for the subject is too great for speech, far too great for a few words at the end of our time. Here I close. But all I have said leads up to this solemn certainty of the life that is yet to be, in earth, in heaven, when force shall be cast out from the kingdom of life, and all mankind shall recognise and acknowledge this great and last revelation of the gentleness, and loveliness of true life; and glorified humanity here and hereafter shall be purified into the perfection of womanhood, and presented to Christ as the Bride.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE KEYS AS EMBLEMS OF ST. PETER.

SIR,—My church is dedicated to St. Peter. I wish, therefore, to know how he should be represented, and what are his proper emblems. I have asked several people, but no one is able to give a reason for the answer that they make; especially to the question, with how many keys he should be shown.

I refer to "Notes Ecclesiological and Historical on the Holy Days of the English Church," and it appears that the keys in his hand were first used about the eighth century, and that in general he carries two keys, one of gold and the other of silver, to absolve and to bind, and thus as it were to open the gates of heaven and hell; occasionally, but rarely, he has a third key, expressing dominion over heaven, earth, and hell; and sometimes he is shown with one key.

Now I contend that this statement is absurd, for, first of all, "keys" are given to him; therefore, where is the authority for one key? Secondly, there is no mention of hell by our Lord when He gave the power of the keys to Peter, or that there were two keys, one of gold and the other of silver (this idea is Miltonic), or in the gift, that the keys should give power over earth and hell as well as heaven.

Our theology has been influenced by poets and artists, and we have sometimes, I venture to think, missed a lesson in the fact, whatever it may be, as for instance in the keys of St. Peter, which are intended to teach that "there are three heavens."

Mr. Isaac Williams writes in the volume, "Study of the Gospels": "All knowledge that is worthy of the name of knowledge consists almost in all cases, if not altogether, in observing analogies, and rests upon the probability which is founded on such similitudes" (page 201).

Now the Godhead is One, and the Trinity inseparable. So Heaven in general terms also is one, and there may be three realms of glory with their divisions within, under the nine orders of angels, and considering Enoch, Elijah, and our Lord Jesus Christ's ascents, evidently three heights of glory are represented.

Pursuing the analogy further, it would seem there are three depths of falling, and that Satan has not yet reached the lowest hell. For by Isaiah xiv. 12, and Luke x. 18, it would appear the *Father* triumphed and expelled Satan from heaven, and his pride being untamed, it was necessary the *Son* should triumph, as He did over death and hell, by the Resurrection. Satan hereby falling lower, it remains for the *Holy Ghost* to triumph, as He will do, when He binds Satan to hurt no more, and he will then reach the lowest depth. Thus it would not be unreasonable to suppose three hells. That a key or keys of hell were given to St. Peter cannot be, as this power is reserved exclusively to our Lord Himself (Rev. i. 19), and Who also evidently speaks of three hells (St. Matt. v. 22), where He speaks of council, judgment, and hell fire. And again, St. Mark ix. 44, 46, 48.

The justice of God seems to demand the belief in three heavens and three hells; for as we are taught of the ten commandments that what is enjoined in the same, the opposite is forbidden, or what is forbidden implies an injunction to fulfil the contrary. So taking the commands on the second table we see there are three degrees of active personal sin, in the sixth, seventh and eighth. Murder and stealing could not be punished alike; for in murder the murderer sins against his neighbour, not only by taking his life but also by depriving him of the power of repentance. He who breaks the seventh sins with his neighbour, but to both the power of repentance remains, and of the eighth, the thief sins against the neighbour, but restitution and power of repentance remain. Of the other three, the fifth, ninth, and tenth, these belong to the *thought*, that seed of goodness and of sin. Yet looking to the characters grouped around the events of the Cross we see the intense loving-mercy of Christ in the amnesty granted by Him—in the sixth, taking the place of Barabbas, redeeming him; in the seventh Mary Magdalene, to whom He first appeared after His resurrection, redeeming and comforting her; and in the eighth, the thief on the cross, in redeeming, comforting, and blessing him by taking him to paradise, so also in the sins of thought, pardoned in the case of Peter, Thomas, and Cleopas. And the rewards to which the martyrs are entitled would mark three heavens. Martyrs in deed without will, those in will and deed, and those in will but not in deed, for the innocent child could not be ranked with the active and tried servant. Then it would seem the *Holy Ghost* will receive into the highest kingdom those who bear best fruit under His influence. The martyrs, confessors and saints. The *Son* will receive all who believe in His name and have accepted His yoke. While the *Father* in His boundless mercy will receive those who have lived according to their light, so that none will be lost but those who positively despise and reject the Son or blasphemously speak against the Holy Ghost.

And thus since St. Paul tells us he was caught up into the third heaven, and because there are three degrees of comparison for good or bad, and because also by analogy the tabernacle was made after the pattern of things in heaven, and the church with its porch, nave and chancel follows suit, I affirm there are three heavens—(and by analogy three hells)—therefore three keys were given to St. Peter. So that it seems to me a mistake to represent St. Peter with only one or two keys, or to say that the keys of earth or hell were given him, and it is fanciful to say the two keys were gold and silver.

Then the emblem of St. Peter should be three keys. Is it not so?

C. J. WILDING.

Arley Vicarage, Bewdley,
July 8th, 1887.

THE Bishop of Liverpool has fixed the 1887 Diocesan Conference for the 3rd and 4th of November. Canon Eyre, vicar of St. Helen's, has accepted the office of honorary secretary.

BURIAL REFORM.—Last week the Council of the Church of England Funeral Reform Association met in London. Mr. Ellice-Clark, C.E., presided. The Hon. Sec, the Rev. F. Lawrence, Vicar of Westow, York, read letters from Viscount Sidmouth, Canon Erskine Clark, Lieut.-Col. Gildea, Dr. Gibbon, and the Rev. J. G. Wood. It was stated that the Archbishop of Canterbury had subscribed £1, the Bishop of London £2, and the Earl of Dartmouth a second £5 to the Society's funds. It was resolved to hold the next annual meeting in October. Great stress was laid by Earl Fortescue and the Hon. D. F. Fortescue upon the necessity of encouraging economy in burial and mourning ceremonial. The Chairman said that it was desirable to bring back the nation to a recognition of the right, always allowed by the Church, of every person to soil sufficient and suitable for the resolution of his body, after death, into its constituent elements. Dr. Campbell and Dr. d'Haviland Hall concurred. It was unanimouly resolved to issue the following circular letter:—"The Council submit that the time has come when there ought to be a combined effort on the part of ministers of religion, members of the medical profession, and men of science generally, to put a stop as far as is possible to the repulsive, dangerous, and utterly indefensible practice of storing up, in the neighbourhood of great populations, vast accumulations of human remains in every stage of arrested and prolonged decay. Sir Spencer Wells, Bart., Sir Lyon Playfair, Sir Douglas Gálton, Dr. Poore, Dr. Thomas, and others have become members of the Burial Reform Association. Mr. Seymour Haden, the eminent pioneer of this movement, has made known the proper method of burying the dead, which is also that prescribed in the Burial Service, viz., burial in the plain earth. Suggestions and practical sympathy will be thankfully received and acknowledged."

SOME fears were entertained that the amount of work required in the newly established Pass Divinity School should deter any considerable number of candidates from choosing it. Such fears have fortunately proved unfounded. Between sixty and seventy candidates presented themselves in this school and were so well prepared that the examiners were able to insist upon as high a standard as they thought either necessary or desirable. The University, and Churchmen in particular, have therefore reason to look with complete satisfaction on the experiment. The new school furnishes, if not a complete, still a substantial compensation for the loss which was involved in the abolition of the compulsory examination in the rudiments of faith and religion.

THE Rev. John Cox Edghill, D.D., Chaplain-General of the Forces, has been elected Bishop of Nova Scotia, in succession to the late Dr. Binney. The rev. gentleman obtained at the first ballot a majority of both orders over Bishop Sullivan of Algoma. Dr. Edghill, who is a Theological Associate of King's College, London, was ordained in 1858. His first curacy was with Canon Vaughan (now vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester), at St. Mark's, Whitechapel, and after serving at Chatham, Halifax (Nova Scotia), Dover, Gibraltar, and Aldershot, he held the office of Chaplain to the Forces at Portsmouth from 1881 to 1885, when he was appointed Chaplain-General, was made a Fellow of King's College, and received the degree of D.D. from the Archbishop of Canterbury.

On Thursday, the 7th inst., the yearly meeting of the Home Reunion Society was held at the society's offices, 2, Dean's Yard, Westminster; the Bishop of Winchester in the chair. The report was read by the secretary (the Rev. R. Milburn Blakiston), after which Earl Nelson moved its adoption. He very warmly commended a paper mentioned therein, containing the correspondence between the Bishop of Winchester and Canon Wilberforce, edited with preface and notes by Mr. John Walter Lea, and hoped it would be purchased by many not belonging to the Church. His own work had drawn attention to the line at which our approaches towards Dissent must stop; and over-fervid Reunionists made one a little anxious. Over-doing the thing was under-doing it; and they must be, not captious, but cautious, in such matters, for instance, as the acknowledging of addresses of welcome from Nonconformists to Church Congresses. One idea he had "bagged" from Mr. Lea's notes. There were great outward surface divisions between Constantinople, Rome, and England, but there was a chasm between us and Dissent. On the one hand, no one branch of the Church could break the unity of the whole, or un-church another branch. But those who separated from a branch of the Church and walked away of their own free will, were on another footing altogether. We might welcome every individual member of such a body; but it was quite another thing to accept the body from which he came. At the late Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom meeting Dr. May had reminded us how earnestly our Reformers appealed, in all they did, to a future Œcumenical Council, should such ever be held, and of their great care in all they did and all they took away, to keep very closely to the Latin Communion, in such matters, for instance, as retaining the *Filioque* clause, although they would not insert the Prayer to the Holy Spirit of the Greek Liturgy. As the heirs of these men, we ought to be very careful how we destroyed our own position, preserved to us by the wonderful care of our Reformers, which was destined, as he believed, in the future to make the Church of England the means of real union between east and west, north and south. The Dean of Lichfield, in seconding the motion, mentioned the questions and answers on the Church which Convocation was framing as of great probable use in furthering unity. If one thing more than another was needed to advance the cause it was that simple but most real quality, tact. From his experience of a large town parish he was perfectly convinced that it only needed a little consideration for the difficulties and prejudices of those who were unfortunately separated from us to cause an abundant influx into the Church. He could testify to the extraordinary advance the Church of England was making at the present moment; everywhere there was a drawing of Nonconformists to it. Canon Medd, in proposing the addition of members to the council, said he regarded the discussion in Convocation respecting the Catechism on the Church as a very fortunate interruption. It would put into the hands of the clergy some very useful instruction on Church principles, the want of which had been a very great hindrance to them. In country districts there was a very strong wish for authoritative guidance with regard to the tone of our relations with Dissenters. It was a very serious hindrance to the cause that the attitude of the clergy was so different in different places. Everything depended upon our prayers for the object we had in common. Canon Venables spoke of his own advocacy of the cause of Home Reunion, in the first Church Congress at Wolverhampton, in 1867, and that the then Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Lonsdale) called him up after it and said, "I charge you never to give up the subject, promise me you will not"—a promise which he had faithfully kept. There were still some very serious impediments. Creeds would not perhaps now be a great difficulty, but Dissenters would not yield on the question of orders. He even feared lest some of our leaders should be carried away to give up too much, to get Reunion quickly. Better wait ten years, and bring about the Reunion on lasting principles, than hasten it one day too soon, and on a wrong foundation. The Church which should be the Church of all must allow various shades of ritual. The Church must have two arms to stretch out to embrace her children, and must be able to meet their earnest longings at every turn. The Bishop of Winchester, who, with Canon Medd, had come straight from Convocation, remarked that although the subject of Reunion was not often for a whole day out of his mind, yet it was rather difficult in the pressure of business to bring one's wits and thoughts at once to bear upon it. The clear proofs there were that the cause of Reunion was advancing were most encouraging; the feeling that disunion was weakness, and union was strength, was now expressed in quarters where one least expected to hear it—these thoughts were permeating society very much indeed. But there was, alas! a vast amount of unbelief, spreading like mushrooms in the dark, amongst the artisan and labouring classes; and wherever unbelief spread, disunion was sure to spread too. One could not help feeling that amidst different polemic discussions, on ritual, on doctrines, on ecclesiastical courts—all important things in their way—we were too much apt to have our eyes and thoughts turned away from far more important things, such as the fact that hundreds and thousands, nay, millions of our fellow-creatures, were pouring into another world, with eyes not opened to the simplest doctrine of Christianity. Within the Church there should be a vast allowance for the liberty of prophesying, and everything that was truly Christian. We all felt most deeply what we had lost by losing Wesleyan Methodism: and could we but gather Methodists back into the fold, all latitude of holding class meetings could surely be allowed to them. Preserving our three Creeds and our Apostolic ministry we could afford great latitude of toleration in ritual—far more really than the invertebrate bodies of the sects. Each different sect thought so much of the petty differences which divided it from its neighbours. But the Catholic Church, strong in its own organic unity, with its Apostolic ministry and its Prayer-book, could afford to allow a large toleration. The Mission-rooms would allow vent for any amount of the free, Dissenting style of worship, while the churches maintained the more grave and dignified services. If we could only get out of our narrow grooves so much union might be effected; and especially if the great societies that divided the Church would only dissolve themselves—possibly if one did the others might follow suit. For himself he was exceedingly sorry that the correspondence between himself and Canon Wilberforce had been published, as he had only regarded it at the time as a friendly correspondence between a Bishop and one of the very important clergy of his diocese. But pressure had been put upon him to allow it; and if it had to be published, with notes, it could not be in better hands than those of Mr. Lea. His own feelings in the matter were anything but unkindly. But it was one thing to be friendly with those near you, and another to be very desirous of uniting with them on an uncertain basis, not strong enough to bear foundations. Having a strong backbone, the Church could protest against all that was un-Catholic in Christendom. One way in which he looked for the advance of reunion himself was in our foreign Mission work. As this advanced further and further every year, it would be the means of uniting us more at home. Missionaries, when they met abroad, found themselves much more in mutual harmony than the societies at home which sent them out. Again, workers in distant lands found it absolutely necessary to fall back upon a well organised Church, and foundation, and principles, and could not deal with native Churches in the same loose way that they did with congregations at home. There was now a better understanding between one missionary and another, one congregation and another; and this came back by reflex action to ourselves at home. That was part of the great value of Mission-work; and no English parish could be thoroughly well worked without attending to Missions. The questions of home and foreign Missions were bound up together. Canon Venables had referred to the Wolverhampton Congress in 1867, where the Bishop had said something that was not favourably received, about union between Dissenters and ourselves. But he very much doubted if such a subject would be unfavourably received in any congress now. A better spirit was growing up all round.

A GOOD index to the growing interest at present taken in theological study at Oxford is furnished by the Theological Class list which appeared last week, and by the success of the initial examination in the Pass School of Theology known technically as Group D. The theological honour list contains fifty-one names; of these nine appear in the first class, twelve in the second, eighteen in the third, and eleven others with one *aegrotat* in the fourth. In the distribution of honours Exeter, Merton, and Keble take the lead—Exeter has two firsts and three seconds, Merton two firsts and one second, Keble one first and three seconds; besides these New College, Christ Church, St. John's gain a first and a second each, and Worcester one first and three thirds. Some colleges are conspicuous by their absence; chief among these Balliol, Corpus, Brasenose, Magdalen, and Hertford. University appears with only one representative. This, no doubt, is in part accidental; but partly also it is due to the fact that in some of these colleges at any rate no adequate provision is made for theological instruction; when such instruction is provided the number of students presenting themselves very rarely fails to increase. One very satisfactory feature in the recent examination has been the excellence of the work done by more than one of the students in advanced Hebrew. There seems every ground for hoping that Oxford is now in a fair way to turn out a considerable number of really competent scholars in this subject, and that a revival may take place of English interest in Hebrew. In this connection we may observe that those most interested in it profess themselves well satisfied with the results obtained in the first examination of the newly founded Oriental School, though the numbers entering for it were, under the circumstances, naturally enough somewhat limited; four candidates presented themselves, and were all placed in the second class.

◆

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Averill, Rev. George, Vicar of Glynde, Sussex; Vicar of Chepstow.
Baber, Rev. Harry, M.A., Vicar of Ram bury; Rural Dean of Marlborough.
Barclay, Rev. William George, Rector of Minterne Magna, Dorset.
Bartrum, Rev. Dr., Head Master of Berkhampstead School; Rector of Wakes Colne, Essex.
Bateman, Rev. Gregory Climenson, Rector of Jacobstowe.
Browne, Rev. Valentine John Augustine, Vicar of Flamstead, Dunstable.
Carr, Rev. W. H., M.A., Curate of Haslingden; Perpetual Curate of St. Peter's, Westleigh.
Curtis, Rev. Francis Hargrave Tindal, Rector of Farmington, Gloucestershire.
Dixon, Rev. Robert, M.A., LL.D., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Eaton, Rev. Alfred Edwin, M.A., Vicar of Shepton Montague, Somersetshire.
Feilden, Rev. J. R., Vicar of Honingham-with-East Tuddenham, Norfolk; Rural Dean of Hingham (Forehoe Division).
Furlonge, Rev. Alexander Montgomery, M.A., Rector of Chilcombe, Dorset.
Gardiner, Rev. W., Vicar of St. George's, Worcester; Vicar of St. Mary's, Marlborough.
Gilmore, Rev. James, Vicar of St. Paul's, Sheffield.
Griffiths, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Curate of Ardleigh, Diocese of St. Albans; Chaplain of Edinburgh Cathedral.
Harper, Rev. Robert, M.A., Rector of Tubney, Berks.
Ivens, Rev. C. L., M.A., Vicar of Emmanuel, Leeds; Vicar of Christ Church, Sowerby Bridge.
Jeffreys, Rev. John, Vicar of Compton Dando, Somersetshire.
Lowe, Rev. Thomas Hill, M.A., Perpetual Curate of West Hill, Ottery St. Mary.
Mills, Rev. W. W., Rector of Aylmerton-with-Runton, Norfolk; Rural Dean of Repps.
Paynter, Rev. William Cambourne, M.A., Rector of Christon, Somersetshire.
Pix, Rev. Henry, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Pleydell-Bouverie, Rev. the Hon. Bertrand, M.A., Rector of Pewsey; Rural Dean of Pewsey.
Ramsay, Rev. William Byron, M.A., Vicar of Everton, Notts.
Sheldon, Rev. James Frederick, B.A., Rector of St. Leonard's, Exeter.
Sladen, Rev. Edward, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Broad Hembury, Honiton.
Sutton, Rev. Henry, Metropolitan Secretary of the Church Missionary Society; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bowesley, Birmingham.
Upcher, Rev. Arthur Charles Wodehouse, B.A.; Rector of Hingham, Norfolk.
Wheat, Rev. James Milnes, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.

◆

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Calcraft, Rev. John Neville, for fifty-five years Rector of Haceby, at Haceby Rectory, near Falkingham, Lincolnshire, on the 11th inst., aged 86.
Campbell, Rev. Thomas, Incumbent of Brothertoft, at Boston, on the 5th inst., aged 53.
Morris, Rev. John, at Askham Bryan Vicarage, York, on the 17th inst., aged 78.
Staniforth, Rev. Thomas, also of Storrs Hall, Windermere, at Kirk Hammerton Hall, York, on the 8th inst., aged 80.
Stevens, Right Rev. William Bacon, M.D., D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Pennsylvania, at the Episcopal residence, Philadelphia, U.S.A., on the 11th inst., aged 71.
Wright, Rev. Henry Wildey, M.A. (Oxon), formerly for nearly forty years Vicar of St. John, Newcastle-on-Tyne, at Lochiehead, Trinity, Edinburgh, on the 5th inst., aged 83.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE MORAL APPEAL OF THE CHURCH.

By the Rev. WALTER LOCK, M.A., Fellow and Theological Tutor of St. Mary Magdalen College, and Sub-Warden of Keble College, Oxford.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford on Whit-Sunday, 1887.

"The fruit of the spirit is love."—Gal. v. 22.

To-day, when we are thanking God for His gift of the Holy Spirit, it may not be amiss to consider for a while something of the nature of that which was the first result of the Spirit's working, and which is meant to be the chief expression of the Spirit's essence—the Christian Church, which it awakened into consciousness of its true life and strength and mission to-day. I would aim at doing so, as far as possible, apart from controversy; although it is indeed true, as had been said by an eminent Nonconformist, that "controversy should be one of the highest and fairest expressions of charity"; but for the present, in order to avoid controversy, I would approach it from the moral side, and ask not, what are the true notes of the Church? or what body corresponds to those notes? but rather what is the moral appeal, which the Church makes upon us, as being the expression of the Holy Spirit? what is the moral temper which it requires?

We shall see this best if we remind ourselves of that to which the Church stands in contrast; what it essentially is not. Now first and foremost—first in point of time, and foremost in importance, though we are too apt to forget this, the Church is not the world: it is the expression of the spirit, not of the flesh; it is the body of those who are willing to obey the teaching of Christ, and not (primarily) of the Jewish Rabbis or (secondarily) of the State or traditions of the world in any age.

This conception is first in point of time; for surely this is the most marked feature of that wondrous scene in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi, when the promise of the foundation of the Church was first made. That scene has been so vividly described several times of late years, both in this pulpit and elsewhere, that I hesitate to describe it again; but we must remind ourselves of it. Jesus had appeared in Judæa, and had been rejected by the Scribes and Pharisees; he had withdrawn into Galilee, and begun to form his body of followers; he had laid down the conditions of discipleship; they must be men who would answer to a great moral demand upon their lives; they must reproduce the virtues of the Beatitudes; they must be ready to be persecuted for righteousness' sake; they must have a standard of righteousness higher than that of Scribes and Pharisees; they must be perfect as their Father was perfect; they must live a disciplined life of prayer and almsgiving and fasting; they must show a single-hearted service to their Master; they must eat His flesh and drink His blood; they must avoid all that was essentially defiling—evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness. His offer had been made to all, but these demands had thinned His followers; many had gone away because of His hard sayings, the masses had been attracted by His miracles, and had misunderstood His teaching and wished to make Him a king, and so He had withdrawn from them. Herod, who had just put John to death, was making inquiries for Him. There He stood, far away on the very outskirts of the Sacred Land, rejected by the leaders of the Jews, misunderstood by the populace, deserted by many of His followers; there where He was in the presence of decaying religions, with the relics of the worship of Pan in that dark cave under the rock, with the temple of Cæsar on the summit above. Was His religion to decay like theirs? The answer comes in the great confession of St. Peter—Thou art the Son of the living God. Though others had scorned, they had heard in His voice that which told of life, and carried its own witness to their hearts; they had remained loyal to it, and in that spiritual insight had seen the truth; and on this loyalty, this readiness to listen not to flesh and blood, but to the Truth, should the Church be founded. On this rock—no mere limestone rock which may pass away, but the firm eternal rock which was Himself—will I build my Church, and the gates of the unseen world shall not have power against it; it shall conquer death. Great Pan is dead; Cæsarism is dead; but on the faith in the Son of the living God the Church of the living God was founded and survives. From under that rock its life burst forth—fresh, clear, refreshing, lifegiving, expanding quickly into a wider stream, like the first outburst of the Jordan at their feet.

The historic exactness of this scene has been doubted, and mainly on the ground of the use of this word ἐκκλησία, which is seldom found elsewhere in Our Lord's words. This is scarcely an adequate ground of doubt; but whether it is or not, the central fact is quite independent of the use of the word. Suppose that Our Lord never uttered this great promise to Peter, still the choice of His disciples under these circumstances remains the same, embodied in the basis of the synoptic tradition. Suppose again, what is more likely, that He spoke, as He loved to speak, of the kingdom of God, and not of the Church, and that St. Matthew has used the word which in common early Christian language took the place of the kingdom of God, still the meaning is essentially the same: the body of His followers are to be organised into a kingdom—a kingdom that stands in contrast to the great world empires of Daniel's vision—a kingdom not of this world. The one essential point for our present purpose is this—that its first foundation implied these qualities of which I have spoken, and therefore that it requires them still. The appeal to be a Churchman is an appeal to a willingness to submit to moral purification, and to a power to see in the material world the Presence of God. It demands morality, it demands moral courage, it demands spiritual insight. It demands morality, for the flesh must be disciplined, and all its works cast aside: it demands moral courage, for every Churchman may have to leave father and mother for the work of this new Master; he may have to hold to the truth in spite of the current of the religious world around him, in spite of the misunderstanding of the masses, in spite of the persecution of the State; it demands spiritual insight which can rise above the mere flesh-bound view of the world and see the eternal in the temporal, which can get beyond—"Is not this the carpenter's son?" to—"Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God."

That is the first appeal which the Church makes —you must stand apart from the world, above the flesh. The second appeal is this. You must stand together. It is an appeal to us for love, for brotherhood. "One is your master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren." "The multitude of them who were filled with the Holy Ghost were of one heart and one soul."

The Church calls aloud—"you have to be saved —not alone; your relation to God is not merely an individual relation: you cannot come to perfection unless you are in a right relation to others; you cannot be content if they are not saved; and therefore you and they must alike belong to a body, in which this right relation may be secured, in which there may be this training in brotherhood." The Church forms the highest means for carrying into effect the second table of the law: and it is obvious that, for this purpose, the brotherhood must be a real tangible, visible brotherhood, where alone true love can find expression in action, and be saved from mere empty profession. Whatever truth science is revealing to us, in so many wonderful ways, of this dependence of man upon man, of our dependence upon our environment, this is taken up and consecrated by this theory of the Church. Such a theory calls us out of selfishness into love; out of isolation into sympathy; out of cynicism into gratitude; out of the vanity which seeks itself in its work into the humility which enables us to work with others in forwarding common aims; out of intellectual narrowness, which limits our creed by that which we can see ourselves, and which, by its strong insistence on some one truth is so akin to madness—into that breadth of sympathy which welcomes fresh truth as it comes from elsewhere, and is ever widening its horizon. Such was the conception of the Church from the first. The common title for its members, was "The Brothers;" this mutual affection was that which most impressed outsiders. *Vide, inquiunt, ut invicem se diligant* (Tert. Apol. 39). "Therefore," says St. Cyprian (De Unit. 9); "the Holy Spirit came as a dove, a simple joyous creature, loving human dwellings, knowing the association of one home." The unity of the Church was urged again and again by St. Augustine in the Donatist controversy, as the necessary expression of perfect love. "All Churches are primitive, all are Apostolical," wrote Tertullian, "while all are one. The communication of peace, the title of brotherhood, the token of hospitality, prove this unity" (De Præscr. xx.).

But, in the present day, two great pleas are urged against this demand for visible tangible unity. We are told, that it is against the Spirit of Christ, that His teaching was to break down division, and all external forms, and to set up a spiritual kingdom. "God is a spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth." Such an objection reads a false meaning into spiritual, and puts it into an antithesis with material. A spiritual religion is opposed to that which is formal or carnal. It is not one which is confined to emotions; but one in which the spirit has got liberty; in which it can freely and gladly take up the whole nature, body as well as mind, and offer it to God's service. The most perfect manifestation of perfect spirituality was in the life of our Lord, and yet that was embodied in true and real human nature; and so the Church may be completely spiritual, and yet manifested in and through human beings with definite limitations. There may be, there must be, one body as well as one spirit. But more than this, such an objection entirely ignores the surroundings in which the conception of the Church arose. Our Lord was not a philosopher propounding a system of philosophy; the abstract philosophy of the Gentile world which shrank from representing the infinite God in finite form always took offence at His teaching. Nay, he was a Jew, speaking to Jews, to men accustomed to find their salvation through intercourse with their nation; to think of God as having chosen the whole nation to be his son, his servant, his beloved; and to think of themselves as gaining their right relation to God, through union with that nation. They, when they had looked forward to the future, and in prophetic hope tried to picture a Messiah and deliverer, had pictured Him sometimes as an individual indeed, but sometimes also as a whole nation or body of people, and so it is not too much to say that the Messianic prophecies cannot be adequately fulfilled, unless we think of Christ as united to and finding His complement in a visible Church of Redeemed Humanity. We have no reason for thinking of the Church as a body less visible than the Jewish nation; or the Kingdom of God as less organised than the Kingdom of David.

But again, it is said—"however this may be—at any rate, now-a-days, it is narrow and exclusive to demand membership in a particular Church. The very principle of love and brotherhood demands that you should love all Christians, nay, more, all men as men without any distinction of creed." Now we admit, of course, at once and ungrudgingly, that this is our ideal; that all men have a capacity for brotherhood. The scene on the day of Pentecost, when "every man heard them speak in his own language," is an inspiring prophecy to us of the time when our message shall be understood throughout the world, and all shall recognise in it the answer to their needs, when all shall be of one heart and one soul.

Again, we admit that in the divided state of Christendom, we cannot press and rigidly apply an ideal test: but still there remains the fact that the Church enshrines an ideal which we are bound to cherish, of an united brotherhood worshipping one God without divisions, and there is the further fact that men at present, are not fit for brotherhood without some discipline, and that the Church supplies the spiritual purification and discipline for it. Is it, indeed, so true that men have this universal instinctive sense of brotherhood? I turn to pre-Christian times, and find there a sharp division between Jew and Gentile, between Greek and barbarian, between bond and free: and only the cosmopolitanism of Stoicism struggling, with slight results, to break down those barriers. I turn even to Christian times, and I look at the present relations of England and Ireland; or of the general state of Europe: is this brotherhood? Side by side with the words "Vide ut in vicem se diligant," I hear the words of a French statesman, uttered some forty years ago, "It frightens me to see the small number of people who really love one another in these days." (M. de Montalembert, *vide* "Life of Bishop Dupanloup," 1,276.) Or look again at the poorer classes in London, and you are told that while full of kindness for their family or their immediate neighbours, they are absolutely distrustful of anything three streets off. Or once more, I turn to the last attempt to construct an ideal brotherhood on the basis of Humanity; and its chief thinker tells me that in forming your conception of humanity, you must not take in all men, but those only who are really assimilable, in virtue of a real co-operation towards the common existence (Comte, "Catech. Posit.," Engl. tr., p. 53), and one who has recently embodied many of his views for English readers, tells us we must eliminate and suppress those who have no altruistic affection (J. C. Morison, "The Service of Man.")

It is impossible to assume a general tendency to brotherhood. You may love every man—in hope of what he may be; but that is something very different from loving every man for what he is. The strong tendencies to selfishness and to impurity in human nature, are always working against brotherhood, and so brotherhood cannot be secured unless the Church's first appeal has been answered, and thus man has submitted himself to purification, and is always under the bonds of a discipline and a faith that make for brotherhood. The Church takes men apart from the world into a seeming exclusiveness, not that she may narrow their sympathies, but that she may deepen them; she takes them, she trains them that they may learn what true brotherhood is, and so care enough for it to be missionaries in its cause. She eliminates, she suppresses no one, for her appeal is to all the world; she despairs of no one, as long as he lives, because she believes that under apparent selfishness and unbelief, there may still be something good being formed; and that the spirit which she possesses, has power to produce that gust of passion and that profound emotion which, it is admitted, can break through inveterate habits. (Service of Man, p. 286.) Yet, while appealing to all, she cannot let her ideal be lowered; she cannot abate a jot of that demand for purification, that assertion of a visible unity, which alone keeps the ideal true. She cannot lower the meaning of her terms. "Sacred terms," it has been said, "when extended to all men apart from sacred conditions, are evacuated of their meaning; instead of the conception of humanity at large being spiritualised, the conception of Christian privileges is secularised." Surely, our every-day experience tells us this. We move about here in a society with varying faiths and different allegiances. All is pleasant, agreeable, kindly. As far as there is a common tie of intellectual work, or of College life, so far there is sympathy, brotherhood. But is it very deep? Does heart often touch heart, or even mind stir mind? But pass into a society—however small, however narrow—where you find men bonded together by a common faith and a common life, what a difference! What an inspiring, stimulating sense of brotherhood: what common hopes and aims: what stirring interest in the way in which these principles, for which they care, are being worked out in the world; how friend strengthens his friend's hand in God; what bright buoyancy of happiness: what open freedom of intercourse. To be in such a company is to be warmed and strengthened oneself, to be made to believe in the possibilities of deep and real brotherhood. Perhaps this may be the truth which underlies that apparently hard saying of St. Cyprian. "He cannot have God for his father, who has not the Church for his mother." (De Unitate Eccl. c. 6); that is to say, he cannot really know the real sense of sonship to God, and of brotherhood to men.

which that implies, unless all his lower, selfish nature has been disciplined and conquered, and he has received the new life of love which the Church imparts.

It is just the real, tangible, visible character of the Church which prevents all such talk of brotherhood from being simply profession; as at first there was this tangible test of brotherhood, that men had all things in common, and no man said that anything was his own, but all was used for the good of the community; so now our gifts and talents and knowledge should be contributed to the good of the whole Church. Is it not specially necessary here in Oxford in these days of specialisation and intellectual dispersion, that there should be some centre, to which each contribution of knowledge may be brought in. How can we learn to trust each other, when we have different studies and scarcely meet each other for common work, unless we see each other recognising allegiance to a common Lord; is not this the ideal of the University celebrations, that here in the centre of the Church's life, scholar and scientist, historian and lawyer, philosopher and doctor, should learn the relation of their own knowledge to the whole; should learn how to respect, and admire the side of truth which others know, and they do not. We must get beyond that low conception of the Church which regards it only as a machinery for the good of the individual; the Church does not exist for the individual any more than a choir does for any one singer in it; the individual rather is for the Church, to be brought to his perfection, that he may help the whole to perform its work, rejoicing in the good of the rest, and in the life of the whole body. So only can we be prepared for a world where

> Licet cuique sit diversum pro labore meritum,
> Caritas hoc facit suum quod amat in altero,
> Proprium sic singulorum fit commune omnium.

There is one other great appeal, which the Church makes to us; it is an appeal for what may be called a loyal receptivity, for a "wise passiveness," for a recognition of our dependence upon the past. This is an appeal which has grown with the centuries, but it has been always there; it asks us—are you ready to accept, to receive that which Christ left, and to hand it on in loyalty to Him. At bottom, it is an appeal to faith. Justification by faith is, indeed, often put in opposition to loyalty to a Church; but this again is a false antithesis. When we speak of faith in this way as the means of justification, we mean that sense of trustful dependence upon God, which realises and accepts what God has done for us, which enters into the life which he gives, and acts by its laws. That is the very essence of the relation of the individual to Christ; and similarly, it is of the essence of our relation to the Church. We start with a thorough recognition of the past. We enter into the life which has been handed down in the world through the Church with gratitude, and we try to be true to it, and live according to its laws. Whatever truth there is in the principle of heredity, in the influence of the past upon the present, this again is consecrated in the historical continuity of spiritual life in the Church. The life flows into us at baptism; its truths are taught us in childhood; they mould our character. We cannot claim to have formed ourselves, to be independent; we must be in an attitude of humility to that which has made us. Such an attitude does not thwart us, nay, rather it puts us into the right condition for the effective dealing with our own lives, and the facts of our own time. The son is not cramped by recognizing what he owes to his parents; rather he can only make this best use of his life, and he recognizes the debt of gratitude to them, and the limitation which heredity has put upon it. The statesman is not cramped by entering into, and recognizing the full force of the life of the past; nay, that is the only method which can make his forward step anything but a leap in the dark. And so we begin to have real moral strength, and intellectual hope as we feel that we have at our back the forces of the past; as around our imagination there grows up a real sense of those who have passed away from this earth, as a cloud of loving witnesses to whose memory we have to be loyal, whose faith we have to hand on. Such a feeling does not put us in opposition to the spirit of the nineteenth century; but it does free us from being at its mercy; it puts us into a position to estimate its value, and to guide its tendencies in the power of the spirit of nineteen centuries.

This receptive attitude refers primarily to the spiritual life which we receive; but it extends necessarily to the doctrines and organisation of the Church, just in so far as they are real expressions of that life. Thus we accept the Creeds, because they are the reasoned-out expression of the instincts which prompted Church life and worship. We can trace their growth, and we see in it a combination of the loyalty to the past, with a most vigorous and keen intellectual criticism. They had to stand the test of strong and searching criticism, both as to whether they did correspond to historic teaching, and as to whether they were the logical rational expression of it. A very candid Christian historian, in dealing with the time of their formulation, comes to this conclusion—"whatever were the errors of Athanasius, his work was undoubtedly a faithful search for truth by every means attainable to him. Little as he knew of nature, that little has its place in his theology. In breadth of view, as well as grasp of doctrine, he is beyond comparison with the controversialists who cursed or still invoke his name. It was far otherwise with the Arians. On one side their doctrine was a mass of presumptuous theorising, supported by alternate scraps of obsolete traditionalism, and uncritical text-mongering; on the other it was a lifeless system of unspiritual pride, and hard unlovingness. And, therefore, Arianism perished. So, too, every system of science or theology must likewise perish, which presumes like Arianism to discover in the feeble brain of man a law to circumscribe the revelation of our Father's love in Christ." * The man, that is, who was most loyal to the past, was the one who had the keenest desire for truth. And the non-Christian writer, who regards this work of Christianity as over, still admits that the controversies of that time were the most stimulating discussions which have ever occupied men's thoughts, and that the Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ has always been a potent stimulus at once of philosophical inquiry and historical research.† In the same way, the great glory of the champion of law and of ecclesiastical polity at the time of the Reformation, was that he insisted on the many-sidedness of truth, coming alike from the Bible, from the Church, from reason; not to be confined to anyone of them, as his opponents were wishing to confine it. *Credite ut intelligatis,* is the constant language of St. Augustine, and the aim of all insistence upon the acceptance of the truth of past ages. We accept the Creeds not to cramp, but to stimulate intelligence.

And so, with regard to Church organisation—this, too, expresses the life at least to this extent, that it recognises that the life, and power, and authority, come directly from Christ himself through the Apostles. The appeal in the second century, as to the standard of truth, was always to that which "the Churches have handed down from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God;" (Tert. Præscr. 37), and consequently it was sought for in these Churches, which could trace their connection with the Apostles. Consequently, no theory can be true which undermines this view; no organisation can be loyal to Christ which starts afresh of itself in a later age. We ought to welcome any new light which may arise as to the exact way in which this Apostolical ministry took its threefold shape; but we must insist that the primary fact of the organisation was the choice of the Apostles by Christ Himself (a fact which is curiously ignored by many writers on the subject), and that the power which He gave them was essentially a spiritual power for the forgiveness of sins and building up of a Church.

Such is the moral appeal which Churchmanship makes to us; you must come out of the world to form a body separate from it; you must come out of isolation into brotherhood; you must come out of caprice into a receptive loyalty. The whole of this appeal comes to us from the earliest Christian documents. To put aside the Acts of the Apostles, as many would not admit its historic value, let me take one undoubted document, written within thirty years of the crucifixion—the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians. Already in it "brother" is a synonym for Christian; already "the Church of God" is one common united body, above the special churches in various places: "The Church of God" which St. Paul had persecuted; "The Church" in which God had placed Apostles, Prophets, and other ministers. But far more important than any verbal argument, is the whole conception of the Church, which lies at the background of St. Paul's argument, and alone justifies it. Listen to that appeal. "What is the meaning," he cries, "of this laxity of discipline? This acquiescence in impurity in your midst? What is this insult to the dignity of the Church, that you go to the law before heathen tribunals, and sink to the level of the heathen morality around you? Away with the evil. Judge these cases for yourselves." There is the moral appeal to a body, whose essence is to stand apart from this world, above the flesh, to be the temple of God. Again, "what is this folly of party-leaders? The Church is an absolute unity, which may not be split up into parts; it is alone dependent upon Christ and not on any human leader. What is the meaning of each man seeking his own, pressing his own rights, displaying his own gifts? The very essence of Christian duty is love, is to edify. Knowledge may tell you that you have particular rights, but love says give up your rights for a weak brother's sake; love says, wait for your poor brother at the Lord's Supper; love says, care little for those gifts which make a display, and much for those which help others, and use all for the good of the whole. You are closely dependent on each other, as limb upon limb, and each limb on the whole body. Love says, give the practical proof of self-denial, by contributing to the needs of the poor of Jerusalem." There is the moral appeal for brotherhood.

Once more—"What is the meaning of this wilful caprice on your part? Setting up fresh leaders, starting fresh customs for yourselves, forgetting or ignoring the traditions which I taught you, and which come from the Lord. Timothy shall remind you how I teach in every church"; "We have no such custom, neither the churches of God"; "What, was it from you the word of God went forth? or came it unto you alone?" "If any man think that he is a prophet or spiritual, let him recognise that what I say is a commandment of the Lord." There is the moral appeal against wilfulness, for a loyal reception of their relation to the rest of the Church.

Once more, this conception of the Church, which here lies in the background, comes out into clear relief, in the so-called epistle to the Ephesians, of which the Pauline authorship is scarcely doubtful, and which speaks with even more general authority, if regarded as a circular letter to the Asiatic Churches. The whole is one constant appeal for a spiritual life, for unity, for brotherhood. It is at once the epistle of the Spirit, and the epistle of the Church.

---

* Gwatkin, "Studies in Arianism," p. 266.

† "The Service of Man," p. 192.

"Thank God," the Apostle cries, "that He has now fulfilled to Christians all the full blessings promised in the Old Testament. These blessings are no accident of our age, as though we could start them afresh—they are blessings intended for man from the foundation of the world, blessings foreshadowed in the earthly promises to the Jews, and fulfilled in a spiritual way in a Church into which you Gentiles have been admitted. He has raised the Messiah from the dead, and made him sit on His right hand; and this has meant that he has raised sinners from the death of sin to the new life of good works; and further that he has broken down the distinction of Jew and Gentile, and united all in one family, one Temple. That is the unity from which we start: one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism; one Body, no less than one Spirit, one body in which the organisation is a gift of the risen Christ, for the purpose of helping each individual Christian to give the contribution of his life and work to the whole life of the body. But these facts require a corresponding effort—an effort to keep this unity: an effort to live a life different from the world and the flesh. This unity is an external thing which can be spoilt and destroyed by evil: you must avoid those evils which mar unity; you must cultivate those virtues which promote unity. You must take your family relations, and work out in these the principle of subordination, because the family is the type of the Church. Finally you must realise the conflict that there must be, between Christ and Evil, and take the armour which God supplies for the contest." Nowhere could you find the appeal for separation, for brotherhood, for subordination, more strongly put.

Such, then, is the appeal which the Church makes to us. It is an appeal for holiness, for it is the appeal of the Holy Spirit; it is an appeal for brotherhood, for it is the appeal of the Spirit of Christ; it is an appeal for receptive loyalty, for it is the appeal of the Spirit which is of God, and which reveals to us the things which are freely given to us by God. It is clear that the appeal for holiness will be weakened if we try to identify the Church with the world or with the State; at any rate, until the world and the State are very different from what they are now. The appeal for brotherhood will be weakened if we ignore the visible organic unity of the Church, and reduce it to a spiritual unity; for it is only through real living contact with others, working together for the same object, that the self-sacrifice, the self-annihilation which is needed for true unity can become parts of our character. The appeal for faith and loyalty to historic continuity, for the true, steady onward march of Christian thought, will become impossible if we ignore the past and create fresh organisations.

We must keep the ideal complete before us. It is marred by Christian failures and Christian divisions. Yet we do not give up our ideal of the State, or of political life, because for the moment legislation is reduced to a weary wrangling and the unlovely struggles of partizanship. No, we put the ideal once more before our minds, and try to make it real. And so with the ideal of the Church; we dwell upon it on this Whit-Sunday, just that we may see the greatness of our failure, and set ourselves to repair it; just that we may remind ourselves of the greatness of our spiritual inheritance, and of the moral life which it entails; just that we may pray to Him who first wakened the body into life to fill it with a fuller life.

Consolator et fundator
Habitator et amator
Cordium humilium,
Pelle mala, terge sordes,
Et discordes fac concordes,
Et affer præsidium.

Two lectures on Buddhism have been delivered by the Rev. Luke Rivington at Grosvenor House. They were very largely attended, and excited so much interest that the lecturer has announced his intention to repeat them on the next two Sunday afternoons at the Kensington Town-hall. Mr. Rivington began by deprecating the idea of surprise at the widespread fascination exerted by the subject of Buddhism, considering the popular notions concerning it. These popular notions, he insisted, were, most of them, unfounded. Comparing the older Pâli texts with later embellishments, it would be found that all that could really be called historical left us with an account of an earnest man, who, in the main, adopted certain recognised modes of teaching and life in vogue at that time, ignoring religion, and proceeding on false principles, and quite unadapted to the ordinary run of human beings. He was no social reformer, and the real coincidences between his life and the life of Christ were merely such as must exist between any two who sought to influence their fellow men. The supposed coincidences between some of the peculiar features of our Lord's life and that of Sakya Muni rest on no historical basis. Thus there was the resemblance between our Lord's temptation and the temptation of Buddha suggested in Mr. Edwin Arnold's poem; but whilst the interpretation of the word "Attavâd" suggested by that writer would succeed in establishing a remarkable coincidence between the two temptations, the real meaning of that word involved the most fundamental difference between the two. The pre-existence of our Lord and the so-called pre-existence of the Buddha had absolutely nothing in common. The second lecture dealt with the philosophy and moral code Buddhism, and in the course of it Mr. Rivington exposed certain fundamental errors concerning man's moral nature, on which the very axioms of Buddhistic morality repose. He explained the meaning of the word Nirvâna and the eightfold path, according to the latest authorities, and concluded with deprecating the idea that esoteric Buddhism could bring any one nearer to God.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
From Mr. CHARLES WHEELER, Barford, Warwick.
"I have felt so greatly benefited by wearing your **ELECTROPATHIC BELT,** that it affords me pleasure to be able to testify to its **curative power.** The swelling and pain in my legs have quite left me, and I experience a comfortable and warming sensation throughout my body."
GOUT & SCIATICA CURED
Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of the **Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,** should at once stop physicing, and remit 21*s*. for HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials POST FREE. **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 23, 1887.

BETTING AND GAMBLING.

WE are glad to notice that in the May Session of the Southern Convocation, something was said on this all-important matter, and we trust that at no distant day the subject may be thoroughly discussed by this august assembly of church teachers. It is one of those evils which permeate nearly all classes of society, from peers of the realm down to the labourers and artisans in our manufacturing towns; but before anything definite can be done, public opinion must be aroused in the matter, and it is one of those questions which must begin with the "upper ten," and then the influence will be felt by the masses. It would, perhaps, be better for the nation if their religious instructors paid more heed to questions of commercial morality. We have societies for the promotion of temperance and purity, Bands of Hope for children, Bands of Mercy for instilling into young minds love for the animal world, and to prevent cruelty to animals. We cannot see any reason, therefore, why, if societies are to be multiplied—which is evidently the case—a society should not be formed for the protection of our young men from the pernicious influence of gambling and betting, although for our part we attach more importance for enduring results to the personal influence and teaching of the clergy. There are many reasons why this evil is on the increase, and one is, the large portion of space which is set apart for sporting news in local daily papers. We have seen in a large public news-room in a northern town, crowds of working men conning the latest news on the turf, with a wonderful amount of interest, and many local newspapers are read *because* of the intelligence contained in them on this subject. Then, again, we hear working men say, "Well, Lord So-and-so bets and has race-horses; if he can do it why shouldn't I?"—forgetting that the loss of a few hundreds to a nobleman is as nothing compared to the losses of a working man, for it means that the poor man's wife and children have to suffer, and often has it happened that in order to pay gambling debts, a man is led to defraud his employer, with the result that months are spent in a felon's cell, and that disgrace has fallen upon him, and his character is gone. But while the ruin to a working man is great, this by no means shields others—greater in power and influence from the evil example they set. Further, the great extent of betting and gambling is provocative of an idle, listless state of mind, and makes many men unfit for their own labour. This may be proved, if we notice the number of men who wander about the country, especially in the summer months, from one race meeting to another, some with eager faces, anxious for the first thing that may turn up, down to the poor fellow who really lives upon "his wits," and is often driven to various shifts and devices to make both ends meet. Far better would it be if they could only be taught that with "all labour there is profit," and that "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread"; that to live upon the losses of others is no true way of earning a livelihood, and that such actions do not dignify the individual, and certainly do not show the great brotherhood of mankind.

And has not the Church a mission for such as these? For we take it, that this is one of those *practical* subjects with which the Church has to deal; for while it is the duty of the clergy to uphold the dogma and doctrines of the Church, and to show in their varied aspects true evangelical doctrines—in the fullest sense of the word—and at the same time to uphold apostolic order, to continue in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship. Yet she must at the same time warn men of the snares and pitfalls which are around and about them. If it is necessary to speak plainly on the sins of intemperance and impurity, surely it is just as important to speak plainly on the results of this sin also. There is nothing absolutely wrong in seeing horses run in a race; nay, more, the spectacle as such may be instructive and extremely exhilarating; yet when it becomes the life-work of men, and when the surroundings are such that the results often lead to beggary and ruin, then is it time to speak out clearly and distinctly.

With regard to the necessity of speaking on this subject, the writer well remembers travelling a few years ago, from Lancashire to a Yorkshire town, and in the carriage there were several young fellows, mostly mill-hands from a neighbouring town, who were just returning from a race-meeting, and were bitterly bewailing their losses and how they had been deceived by a bookmaker, and in course of conversation appealed to a gentleman who was present. The opportunity thus given was by no means lost, for he showed them, in a kindly spirit, their weakness and foolishness, and judging from their manner the lesson was by no means lost. He took it not from a religious, but from a purely secular point of view, and so brought the thing home to them. We could wish that more was said on the subject, and on commercial morality generally. The clergy might well, take up the matter, and bring it before young men; and honest, earnest, Christian laymen, those who know the ways of the world, might often lend a helping hand to warn the young and inexperienced, and to those who are further advanced in betting and gambling transactions. It is, we fear, an evil which is growing, especially in the large towns, and manufacturing districts; and therefore we maintain that churchmen should speak out with no uncertain sound on this matter, and place the question in its true light and bearing before men, with the result that possibly many "brands may be plucked from the burning," and that many a working man's home may be made happier and brighter, when once this lurking evil, this restlessness, this haste to be rich without labour, is for ever cast out.

THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.—AN EVIDENCE OF REVELATION.

By the Rev. CROASDAILE E. HARRIS.

Introduction.

The Messianic Prophecies are an evidence of Revelation. The very existence of Revelation has been said to depend upon one practical test. It must be true to human nature and to human thought. It must complete the finite and satisfy the infinite longings of man. All the religions of the world have propounded at their best new and ever true verities in the progression of truth. Distortion, exaggeration and partiality have been the pitfalls and the ruin of all—save one. This latter claims what none other claims, a Divine Revelation. Christianity further lays claim to all the Human as well as the Divine. True Catholicity, in its widest sense, is the co-ordination of all the varied aspects of truth. The fundamental basis of Christianity is the doctrine of the Incarnation; in other words, the Incarnation is the catholic or universal foundation-stone of Christianity. Eighteen hundred years have proved that Christianity is true to human nature. In spite of many frowning waves of vagarious doubt, produced by the gradual changes of time, or by sudden tempests of scientific discovery, the Church of Christ has sailed and still sails on its way, taut and seaworthy, on the great ocean of human thought.

Human thought is restless, ever possessed with the desire to know. Reason is the alchemy given to test knowledge and leave the precipitate of truth. Reason not knowing all things accepts an handmaiden, faith. When reason meets with an axiom which is irrational, *i.e.*, indemonstrable, then faith steps in, and reason, acting on faith, assumes as a certainty by a deductive process that which by itself is unknown.

An evidence, therefore, for a primary axiom may be discussed from two points of view. By an inductive process a large number of probabilities may be accumulated as proofs; by a deductive process the primary axiom is accepted and the truth deduced according to the conviction furnished by the proofs.

This is an attempt to prove the truth of the Messianic prophecies as an evidence of Revelation, by showing that the acceptance of this truth is the only rational hypothesis for reason to start from. The probabilities for such a theory are demonstrated by the origin, development and fulfilment of the prophecies. This is not, however, sufficient by itself. The logical conclusion of such a basis can only lead to conjecture.

The second part, therefore, is a deduction of the truth by accepting and starting from the truth itself. The centre truth of the Messianic prophecies is the Incarnation. The Incarnation becomes the primary axiom. The proposition once established is proved incontestably true by logical demonstrations. Religion assumes the supernatural. The truth of the Incarnation is a supernatural fact. If the axiom be accepted the supernatural demonstrations of a divine inspiration, mystery, and Catholic interpretation must logically be accepted also; else any exposition of prophetical evidence is built on a foundation of sand, which will scarcely bear a battering storm of criticism.

Messianic prophecy perhaps above all the other "mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," presents the greatest difficulty to one searching for light in the twilight over-growth of modern intellectualism; for of all Scripture evidence prophecy claims the most complete submission of reason and faith. In rational argument it is only fair to allow the hypothesis that the objections to the cogency of Scripture evidence may not necessarily be groundless. If this incomplete sketch contains a line of thought which may convince or persuade that that submission is logically necessary, then it has not been written all in vain. The question is in itself exhaustless. It is only possible in treating of an exhaustless subject to look at one aspect at a time and touch most scantily on the heads only of the arguments.

In the following argument there may not be much of originality, save perhaps in the construction and arrangement of thought. Ideas of one mind, however original they may seem, can but be the assimilation and affiliation of the thoughts of others. The condiment in the crucible is often, however, of very diverse quality and substance to the compounds of which it is made up; without claiming entirely original parentage, this attempt can truthfully call itself the child of a religious difficulty, searching for truth.

And in discussing the subject from this stand-point, the writer does not forget the sapless sterility of a mere intellectual persuasion. Profession of a creed is often at variance with expression of it. Thought must result in action. Christ is more than the hero of the greatest tragedy of human history; He asks for more than a compact theory to believe in Him. Across the wastes of time and matter, the Incarnate God calls for the life of every hour, "He is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever," and it is He alone 'That openeth and no man shutteth."

I.

1.—ORIGIN.

FOR generations and generations the true Israelite, crossing the threshold of the other life through the portals of death, has uttered in Hebrew his confession of the Divine Unity.

In his death he proclaims the unity, but by his life here on earth he has unconsciously proclaimed the truth of the Trinity in Unity.

"Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" was once the sneer of prejudice. The world might well have asked two thousand years ago whether any good thing could possibly come out of Judæa. Reason would answer that it was an absolute improbability. But out of the heart of a wild, uncultivated, and illiberal tribe issued the Religion of the world. Cut off by habit, law, and many a prejudicial peculiarity, the Jewish nation absorbed the best thought of other nations into its own forms, moulded it, gilded it with a purity of gold, and unconsciously gave it back as a glory of new wealth to the world. The centre truth of the Mosaic economy was the truth of the one God. This economy proclaimed the Individual Personality of the Creator, in Whose image man was made; it proclaimed His ever-abiding personal presence; it proclaimed His superintendence; and, further, it proclaimed what the ages should unfold, disclosing the most secret counsels of His eternal Will. This extraordinary revelation was certified by extraordinary demonstrations. Man speaking in God's name was bound to accredit his Divine mission to man; therefore we find in the Hebrew Scriptures that they give us two credentials for the truth of their revelation—miracle and prediction. Whatever value historically the mere statement of the miracles may be, it is impossible to forget the fact that the prediction is here. No amount of rationalistic elimination can rationally explain away the unparalleled prophecy of the Hebrew people. Even supposing the Messianic interpretation to be false, or the fulfilment of facts to be but coincidences, the world would still be left with a literature of marvellous prophecy, which no ambiguous oracle, no wild necromancer, nor any of the wisest of wise augurs could have conjured up. The supernatural origin is the only rational light to throw on the existence of such an unique literature. When we can put side by side prediction and fulfilment, still more does it become convincing that He alone can foretell the future, Who can guide it.

Starting, therefore, on the preliminary hypothesis that this revelation has been rationally demonstrated, we reject the supposition that what may seem irrational is mere philosophical abstraction, and accept the element of the miraculous and the supernatural, which the foreknowledge of future events assuredly must be. Prophecy, then, is in itself a miracle. On this primary axiom hangs the demonstrative trustworthiness of the Messianic prophecies; on the truth of the origin of the Messianic prophecies hang "all the law and the prophets." For undoubtedly the essence of Hebrew prophecy is Messianic; the Scriptures foretold a Messiah: "and if in them there be found prophecies of the Messiah, prophecies, be they many or few, like precious stones imbedded in a rock, we have then the phenomenon existing, and we have to explain how it came." "Idoneum, opinor, testimonium divinitatis veritas divinationis."* The phenomenon is only explained by the miraculous or supernatural. The miraculous or supernatural are only proved impossible by denying the very existence of God. The fact of the existence of God as the Great Revealer can give us the only rational exposition of the origin and existence of these prophecies. Both Jew and Gentile, therefore, believed that the oracles of God were intimations of what was to come to pass. Both to Jew and to Christian they are Messianic prophecies, intimating the Deliverer, where—

> Thought by thought is piled, till some great truth
> Is loosened, and the nations echo round.

It stands to reason that if there be anything of importance that God has decreed or designed, it must surely be "the giving of His own Son." "The great miracle is the Incarnation; all else, so to speak, follows naturally and of course."* Therefore to the Christian those prophecies have developed in a very full degree to fulfilment, for the Messiah has come in the person of Jesus Christ; God, therefore, is more than one eternal Almighty Lord, an undivided substance, for God has revealed Himself to be a Trinity, three co-equal and co-eternal Persons. The Jew, therefore, holds the primary faith of the Unity, but does not accept the Christian development of the Trinity in Unity. And so the Jew, while confessing the undivided Unity in all the attributes of His existence, is a witness to the Christian of the truth of the blessed Trinity. And who will dare say, even now in the nineteenth century of their world-wide dispersion, to that "peculiar people": "The fountain of their life is dried up; they shall for ever cease to be a nation"?

2.—DEVELOPMENT.

WITHOUT touching on the great doctrine of the gradual development of the Messianic prophecies, an essayist would omit an almost incontestable proof of the historic worth of the Revelation. It has been well said, "the order of Revelation is Revelation itself."

The question arises: was the whole Messianic system and all its consequences revealed at once and once for all, or was the seed sown to unfold and gradually grow and blossom into flower? It seems to be in strict analogy with all of God's dealings with man that the truth should be given and left to develop by a scientific process of evolution. The question in fact resolves itself into a simpler form—Is the Messianic prophecy a dry, historical fact, or is it a living reality?

The system of the Divine economy is undoubtedly that of a covenant. This covenant contained an everlasting promise "to Abraham and his seed for ever." If it had been but a dry, historical fact—this promise given by prophecy—then in its development and fulfilment it would have been finite. But its effect and significance were not exhausted or fulfilled even in one generation, or even in a hundred. The Jew still looks for the fulfilment according to his light. The Christian has accepted the fulfilment in Christ, but waits still for the fuller development of the promise. Both Jew and Christian are witnesses of the Divine reality of the development of prophecy.

This assertion is its own proof, for Messianic Prophecy has been an inexhaustible source adapted to all generations, who have been undergoing endless changes; it is full of truths which all these generations have not and will not use up, adapted to meet every contingency and every inquiry. It is a Divine reality and therefore of its own nature is it infinite, and only capable of full interpretation to finite man by a gradual development. It is an apparent fact, apparent to the most superficial student of the world's history, that the mind of man requires a training, and a long training often, before it can digest a new truth. Greek philosophy and Roman law had paved the way for the idealism and the glory of love which was preached to the world in the Sermon on the Mount. Jewish monotheism had trained the Jewish mind in preparation for the truth of the Incarnation through two thousand years. The elaborate exclusiveness of Judaism had practically imprisoned the Jew in its own high walls. But there was in this prison a window through which the light of heaven beamed in, and that window was prophecy.

---

* Tert. "Apolog," c. 20.

* Archb. Trench, "On the Miracles," p. 8.

The universal application in the New Testament of the prophetic writings to the expected Messiah, as the general anti-type of all the events of the typical dispensation was not an unwarrantable interpolation. "It seems to have been a received axiom of interpretation that the subject of all allusion, the represented in all parables and dark sayings, was He who was to come, or the circumstances attendant on His advent and reign."* Anyone with an open Bible in his hands can trace the actual historical development of prophecy. Prophecy is of two kinds—temporal and evangelical. The central truth of the evangelical is the fact of the coming of One who was to be the world's deliverer, and as the facts develop, as the picture, so to speak, is being painted of Him who is to come, not one fact contradicts another, not one colouring is out of harmony with another. Each prophecy springing from some temporal event is lifted nto the sublimity of a future interpretation. The temporal prophecies were fulfilled in their order, and in their fulfilment developed more and more toward the consummation of a higher interpretation. And as it was with the Jew so it is even now with the Christian. The steadfast eyes of Christian Faith watch prayerfully the wondrous development of the new dispensation. Christ, the Reason, the Word of God, came not without lifting the veil off the future and disclosing to faith what that Reason had willed it to be.

Christ's last human words to his followers were accepted as an inspiring prophecy as well as a temporal commission. "Go and teach all nations," is a fact of the nineteenth as much as of the first century of Christianity. *We* only can more fully realise what a wondrous development that commission has had and still is having. In the fulfilment of this commission we see the development of prophecy. The Church of Christ claims in her own universality all nations as her own. She teaches by her ordained ministry; and they are the ministers of the Word and of the sacraments of the Word. Slowly but surely Christianity is embracing the four corners of the world. Development is the fulfilment of prophecy, for Christ said, "Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world."

3.—FULFILMENT.

WE pass on to the greatest external proof of the revelation of prophecy—its fulfilment.

The question naturally arises, have or have not the Messianic prophecies been fulfilled?

The Deist (and the Jew is surely the most exalted believer in Deism), emphatically denies that they have. Christ was a virtuous man, even a prophet, for he foretold the destruction of Jerusalem. But Mahomet also was a good man and a seer of God. In other words the very divinity of our Lord and Master hangs on the acceptation of the fulfilment of those prophecies, which both Jew and Christian are agreed refer to "Him who was to come." It is Christ Himself and the Apostles who assert over and over again that He came to fulfil the Scriptures. The matter, therefore, resolves itself into a question of belief. If Christ was not the Messiah, then the Christian interpretation of the Messianic Prophecies can scarcely be profitable. Then we must conclude that the numberless agreements existing between the life of Christ and the prophetic predictions are after all only curious coincidences—wonderful no doubt both to believer and unbeliever alike, but still nothing more than coincidences. Undoubtedly the proof drawn from the fulfilment of prophecy is left without much demonstrative value when it is pleaded that the Christian interpretations are forced and fanciful, and that the narrative of Christ's life has been accommodated to the prophecies. But is this rational? Scarcely so; for if we once accept the origin and development of the prophecies to be Divine, we must accept the rational demonstration of Christianity, that they have been fulfilled and are being fulfilled. It may be answered that this is a circular argument. It may be so; perhaps it must be so, for the one centre of all truth is the Incarnation, and round this must the rays of light radiate. At all events, that man must be "wise in his own eyes" who can esteem worthless the interpretation of all the great and the learned and the wise who for nearly nineteen hundred years have accepted Christ as the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies.

To such a one as this there are only two courses open: either he must accept the Jewish interpretation, or rather want of interpretation, in which case the fulfilment is yet to be; or he must gradually drift into the gulf of modern heathenism and then all prophecy of a Messiah becomes mere verbiage. Even if the Jewish theory be accepted the prophecies become almost verbiage without meaning—in fact their only intelligible meaning is so strongly in favour of the Christian interpretation that the modern school of Rabbis are of necessity reduced to the expediency of explaining them away.

The circumstantial evidence is at least overwhelming. We take the prophecies as they come—what Jacob says of Shiloh, what Moses says of one greater than himself, what David continually hints of and describes, a great son to be born of his family, what Isaiah says of a child to be born, a son given whose name should be wonderful, the mighty God, Eternal Father and the Prince of Peace, on whom the Lord should lay the iniquity of us all, what David says of Messiah the Prince, cut off for others, of a Son of Man, whose kingdom, given Him by the Ancient of days, is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away—what Malachi says concerning the forerunner of the Messiah—all these are accepted by Christian and Jew as pointing to One who should be sent from heaven to save the Jewish nation and bless other nations in them. It is an undeniable fact that there was among Gentiles as well as Jews an impatient expectation of a divinely appointed deliverer who should arise out of Judæa. This expectation reached its culminating point during the early years of the Roman government of Syria. Now at this very time there did arise and live in Judæa a Man like unto whom no other man had lived before or has lived since. He claimed His life and His death to be fulfilments of the Messianic prophecies. He showed how first He came to the Jews but they cast Him off, then how "the crumbs were given to the dogs," and how by their own denial of the truth the Jews were blessing the Gentiles with the truth. Then His teaching produced in the world an unparalleled political, social, moral and spiritual revolution. The promise that was latent in God's covenant with the father Abraham was now beginning to work out its fulfilment. The glory of the people of Israel was the light to lighten the Gentiles. The very curse that seems to rest on the wandering Jew is a fact in accordance with his own Scriptures. It can scarcely be a rational judgment to put down such tremendous evidence for the verification of the Christian interpretation to mere casual coincidence. If it be granted that there be a Providence, the hand of Providence must be seen here. The agreement of prediction and fulfilment cannot be denied. Because some prophecies seem to have had different developments to expectation, and because some seem yet to tarry in their first fulfilment, are matters which rest only with the investigating microscope of criticism. The prophecies give us the outline, the history of the world gives us the fulfilment. This fulfilment may seem beyond the comprehension of the perceiving, understanding and reasoning intellect of finite man. We answer the sceptic "But believe in the Incarnation." Fulfilment becomes then the proof of prophecy.

---

* Alford, "On St. Matthew," ii. 15.

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE KEYS AS EMBLEMS OF ST. PETER.

SIR.—This question concerns an archæological subject which is not within a book*seller's* province. St. Peter is usually represented with two keys, not infrequently with one key, and rarely with three. The pictorial monuments began in the fourth century, and the traditions of Christian art were maintained in a pretty uniform way throughout the middle ages; but in matters of this kind there could not but have been some variety. Examples of the earliest times would have justified all the three modes. I believe that the *three keys* were used more in the iconology of the Greek and Eastern Churches. "The Lord of the Three Worlds" is still a title for the Deity in Oriental literature. BERNARD QUARITCH.

15, Piccadilly, W.

Reviews and Notices.

"CHURCH TEACHING." Sermons by the Rev. A. Lush, formerly Vicar of St. Matthew's, Lee, Ilfracombe. Ilfracombe: Twiss & Son. Pp. 155. 1887.

THIS volume is interesting in many ways. The author was vicar of a parish in North Devon for some years, and died there in the month of April last year, and the sermons which we have given to us were preached to a mixed congregation of country people, agricultural and maritime, and many visitors to the coast scenery of North Devon. They are terse, clear, and incisive, especially in the statements of doctrine, yet so worded that the simplest could understand their meaning; there is no "padding," as it is called.

The first sermon is on St. Matthew, and was preached on St. Matthew's Day, the feast of the dedication of the Church; and, speaking of the giving names to churches—a subject little known or understood by a great many people—he says:—

> His (the saint's) name is given to a church in order that he himself may be honoured, in order that men may remember him as often as they have occasion to speak of the Church that bears his name, in order that his good deeds done as an apostle and evangelist for the Church of Christ may be had in grateful remembrance, in order that his good example may be followed. As long as we do not worship the saints as if they were God, we can hardly have too great reverence for them, or treat them with too great respect.

The sermon on "The Blessing of God" is very good, showing the great necessity for asking God's blessing on the fruits of the earth, as at Rogation-tide, a fact which in these days especially ought not to be forgotten. It is said by some that the cause of the continued depression in trade and agriculture is due to the fact that we, as a nation, have neglected our duty in this respect, and certainly it is only reasonable that, as we offer up our praises and thanksgiving at our harvest festivals for the in-gathering of the crops, so we ought to supplicate God's grace and favour to bless the seed sown, so that it may increase and multiply. Reference is also made to the fact that in the Isle of Man in the last century

> It was the custom of the island, binding on the clergy, to attend the boats of the herring fleet before they put out to sea, to pray with the fishermen, and let them start with a blessing. And even now it is customary for the Manx fishermen, before starting for the mackerel fishing, to have a farewell service in the parish church before they leave their native shores for the south of Ireland, where the bulk of the mackerel are caught. And reference is also made in this volume to the petition in the Litany (placed there by the saintly Bishop Wilson), which is used in all the churches in the Isle of Man, viz., "'That it may please Thee to give and preserve to our use the kindly fruits of the earth, *and to restore and continue to us the blessings of the sea*, so as in due time we may enjoy them."

The most striking sermons are those on "Tithes" God's, and "The Things which are Cæsar's"; and in the former the duty of paying tithe is clearly stated, thus:—

> But that tithes ought still to be paid, either in kind, or in a fair money value, will be clear to every Christian who believes the Word of God, who believes in God's over-ruling Providence, who heartily prays, "Give us this day our daily bread," who trusts in the priesthood and sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, who strives to follow in the footsteps of God's saints, whether in the olden times or in the times of the early Church. There is one more reason binding on us in England, that tithes were given to God's Church by the owners of the land 1,000 years ago. No landlord has a better right to his rent for the nine-tenths, than God has to His tenth.

The sermon on "The Things that are Cæsar's" was evidently written shortly before the General Election of 1885, for in it we find the following:—

> It is the duty of every voter to take care not to vote for any one who will support those leaders who are ready, not only to take away from God's Church the property that is His, but also to take from the Queen the things that are hers."

Speaking also of the attempt to do away with the House of Lords, he says:—

> There is no doubt that if the House of Lords were swept away, the throne of our Queen would soon be overturned.

In another sermon, speaking of the popular errors with regard to the Church, we find the following :—

> The Church of England was established, was powerful in this country, before there was any Parliament, before there was any House of Commons chosen by some of the people, even before there was any general assembly or meeting of the great men and the wise men of the whole country.

So again :—

> Let us turn to the chief thing in the endowment of the Church —the payment of tithes, the tenth part of the produce of the land, or the value of it in money. This was also a good thing established, not by the House of Commons, nor by the Parliament, but by those saintly men who preached the Gospel here, and who gradually persuaded their converts to support the Church by the payment of tithes. They fixed upon the proportion one-tenth, because it was what God had commanded the Jews to pay to the priests and Levites.

It is evident from the extracts that we have made, that the publication of this volume of sermons is calculated to do a great deal of good, especially with such clear and explicit statements on tithes and other matters, about which so much ignorance unfortunately exists. We most heartily commend this little book, and hope that it may be widely read by all, both clergy and laity alike. Many of the clergy may learn from it how to put forth the teaching of the Church in a way that will be "understanded of the people."

MR. MILNER, the organising secretary of the Church Association, has been appointed general secretary in the room of the late Dr. Fleming.

AN aged clergyman has passed away at Bath, in the Rev. John Bathurst Deane, who had reached his ninetieth year. Mr. Deane graduated from Pembroke (Sen. Op.) in 1820, and was ordained in the following year. For some years he was second classical and head mathematical master at Merchant Taylors', curate of St. Benetfink and St. Michael's, Wood-street, and preacher at the Philanthropic Institute, but in 1873 he was appointed to the rectory of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, with St. Martin-Outwich. He was the author of a work on "Serpent Worship," and a "Life of Richard Deane, General at Sea in the Service of the Commonwealth," from whom he was descended.

ON Thursday, the 7th inst., a drawing-room meeting was held at 7, Cromwell-place, the residence of Sir M. Monier-Williams, on behalf of the Bishop of Japan's Mission. There was a large gathering, among whom were three ladies, Miss Braxton Hicks, Miss Thornton, and Mrs. Kirks, who proceed to the work in October next. Sir M. Monier-Williams took the chair and gave an interesting account of what he himself had witnessed of the Bishop's work, when Dr. Bickersteth was at the head of the Cambridge Delhi Mission. He had no doubt that the Bishop would show the same administrative ability and power of organisation in Japan which he had displayed in India. Missionaries in Japan were confronted with three systems, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Shintoism. If he were asked to give some idea of Buddhism in a few words, he would say that its essence consisted in trying to make the force of one's own acts one's only God. This force was said to be powerful enough to recreate one at death, and in this way every human being was reproduced through a countless series of new births in various forms, till a Buddhist's only salvation was attained—namely Nirvana. There were two sects of Buddhism in Japan; one held that the Nirvana was a kind of hazy beatitude—a condition of half-conscious, half-unconscious bliss—the other that it was the utter extinction of the Ego, or, in other words, absolute cessation of personal existence. He was not an authority on Shintoism, or the indigenous religion of Japan, but he believed it to be the adoration of gods many and lords many, mixed up with a good deal of human hero worship. Canon Mason, of All Hallows, Barking, explained that the Bishop needed money to enable him to erect buildings for the Ladies' Associated Mission on some land in Tokio, which had been advantageously leased. Buildings were also required for a University Mission-house, and the total cost was estimated at £1,200. Towards this sum the Bishop himself had given £300, and hoped to get about the same sum from various societies. For the other £600 he was asking the help of English friends, who had already subscribed over £200. If the required sum were forthcoming by August 1, the fact would be telegraphed to the Bishop in Japan, and the building would be begun at once, to be ready for the ladies, who were to sail from England on the 5th of October.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Akroyd, Rev. S. F., Curate-in-Charge of St. John's Polegate; Vicar of All Saints', Crowborough, Sussex.

Angel-Smith, Rev. Stuart Cecil Frank, M.A., Chaplain of Christ Church and Magdalen College, Oxford; Rector of Theale, Berks.

Campion, Rev. Afred, B.A., Curate of St. Luke's, Leek; Vicar of Sneyd, Burslem.

Collier, Rev. E. C., B.A., Curate of St. Clement's, Lower Broughton; Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's District, Hollingworth, Cheshire.

Davies, Rev. J. Paget, Rector of Streat; Diocesan Inspector of the Central Division of Chichester Diocese.

Dudley, Rev. Francis, B.A., late Vicar of Wrenthorpe, Wakefield; Assistant Priest of All Saints', Southend-on-Sea.

Egan, Rev. Robert, Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Tourmaline.*

Harrison, Rev. Albert Richard, M.A., Senior Curate of the Collegiate Church, Wolverhampton; Vicar of St. Chad's, Stafford.

Harvey, Rev. John Kentish, Rector of Horsington, Lincolnshire.

Innes, Rev. Williamson Rust, B.A., B.C.L., Senior Curate of St. John-the-Evangelist, Edinburgh; Vicar-Choral of Hereford Cathedral.

Morgan, Rev. F. A., Vicar of Chepstow; Vicar of Broadway, Worcestershire.

Newman, Rev. Sholto J. H., Curate of St. Mary's Episcopal Chapel, Castle Street, Reading; Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Hastings.

Norwood, Rev. R. P., M.A., Rector of Ampney St. Peter, and Ampney St. Mary, Gloucestershire.

Pattenden, Rev. Dr., Head Master of Boston Grammar-school, and Honorary Canon of Lincoln; Vicar of Chertsey.

Savory, Rev. Borradaile, Curate of St. George's, Hanover Square; Rector of St. Bartholomew's, West Smithfield.

Stewart, Rev. Herbert, Vicar of Ramsgill, Pateley-bridge, Leeds.

Swatman, Rev. Philip, Chaplain of St. Pancras Cemetery.

Todd, Rev. G. A. J., Rector of Codicote, Gloucestershire.

Watson Rev. John Sikes, late Rector of Cotesbach, Lutterworth; Rector of Lowick, Northamptonshire.

Worlledge, Rev. Prebendary, Principal of the Clergy School, Leeds; Chancellor of the Cathedral, and Principal of the Theological College, Truro.

Yolland, Rev. B. S., M.A., Rector of Doynton, Gloucestershire.

The Church of England Pulpit.

ORDINATION.

By the Rev. J. B. KEENE, M.A., Rector of Navan, Head Master of Navan College, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Meath.

Sermon Preached at an Ordination by the Bishop of Meath, on St. Peter's Day, June 29th, 1887.

> "And when He had said this, He breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."—St. John xx. 22, 23.

THE subject of the sermon that is to be delivered on such an occasion as the present is accurately defined by our Prayer Book. The Rubric for deacons' orders directs that the sermon should declare the duty and office of such as be admitted deacons, how necessary that order is in the Church of Christ, and also how the people ought to esteem them in their office. A similar rubric precedes the office for the Orders of Priests.

Upon the general subject of the origin of these orders, I shall merely say this much, that both grew out of the necessities of the Church. As the Church increased in numbers a greater organisation became necessary to save it from disorder and disintegration. It was thus that all the offices under Divine Providence came into being. They were established to make provision for more systematic instruction, to preserve decency and order in public worship, and to distribute the charities of the Church. We read of "teachers, helps, governments, pastors and teachers." Several such offices, found superfluous, disappeared. What was considered to be permanently beneficial was preserved. In this way the orders of Deacons and Priests received final and definite Apostolic sanction. The office of deacon, which was clearly intended to be a permanent one, and the utilisation of which in this direction has been the subject of much consideration of late, differed from that of presbyter in being quite novel. It was founded for the relief of the Twelve Apostles, from the duty of serving tables, to the end that they might more completely devote themselves to "prayer and the ministry of the word." However, the deacons seem not to have been long confined to the mere superintendence of the charities, for we find Philip baptising and preaching; Stephen, too, in like manner. Hence gradually arose the present conception of the public duties of a deacon, so admirably summed up in our Ordinal, where the Bishop says: "It appertaineth to the office of a deacon to assist the priest in Divine Service. Specially in the ministration of Holy Communion, to read Holy Scriptures and Homilies in the Church; to instruct the youth in the Catechism; in the absence of the priest to baptise infants, and preach if admitted thereto by the Bishop. Furthermore, to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish, and intimate their estates, names, and places where they dwell, unto the curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved with the alms of the parishioners."

The duty and office of priests is summed up in these solemn words: "Have in remembrance to how weighty an office and charge ye are called; that is to say, to be messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord; to teach and premonish to feed and provide for the Lord's family; to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever." "See that you never cease your labour, your care and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty, to bring all such as are committed to your charge unto that agreement in faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among you either for error in religion or for viciousness of life." Such is the summary given by our Church itself of the duty and office of Priests and of Deacons. But as both orders are about to be conferred to-day, in place of dwelling in detail upon the duties of either, I shall dwell upon that which is, I believe, the primary requisite for the due discharge of each. For well may the Bishop, after the declaration of the dignity and importance of such an office and charge, well may he exhort those approaching to "pray continually to God the Father, by the mediation of our only Saviour Jesus Christ, for the heavenly assistance of the Holy Ghost."

Therefore have I chosen for our meditation this morning the words addressed by our Saviour to the Apostles, in giving them their commission, and which have been adapted into our office for priests' orders.

"Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." I shall not discuss the interpretation of the latter part of these verses—which concern what is commonly called the power of the keys. Suffice it to say that a deliberate declaration has been made by our Church in the Preface of the Revised Prayer Book, in which, in its review of the ordinal, an interpretation is put upon these words: "No change has been made in the formula of ordination of priests, though desired by some; for, upon a full review of our formularies, we deem it plain and here declare that, save in the matter of ecclesiastical censures, no power or authority is by them ascribed to the Church or to any of its ministers, in respect of forgiveness of sins after baptism, other than that of declaring and pronouncing on God's part, remission of sins to all that are truly penitent, to the quieting of their conscience, and the removal of all doubt and scruple; nor is it anywhere in our formularies taught or implied that confession to or absolution by a priest are any conditions of God's pardon; but on the contrary, it is fully taught that all Christians who sincerely repent and unfeignedly believe the Gospel, may draw nigh as worthy communicants to the Lord's table without any such confession or absolution." I believe a comparison of the several passages in the Gospels with their context, a consideration of the practice of the Apostles, and a study of the usage of language at the time fully bear out the conclusion arrived at in this declaration, by which our Church pronounces her final verdict upon the controversy. That a similar interpretation was put upon these words at the time of the Reformation may I think be inferred from the fact that even by the ultra reformers no objection seems to have been raised to the use of them, though ground for their removal might have been found by objectors in the fact that this form of words is not found in any ordinal before the twelfth century, and is not, to the present day, made use of in the Eastern Church. But with regard to the previous words, "Invoking the gift of the Holy Ghost," it is very different. For in all ordinals—east and west—there is some form or other of invocation for the gift of the Holy Ghost. This is deemed essential to the service. There is one, of which we have a fragment bearing the name of St. Clement, which has been traced back to a time prior to the age of Constantine, and which is believed to represent the manner of ordaining in the second century. It commences with the words, "Give unto him, Almighty Lord, of Thy Holy Spirit." The words in a form of the eighth century are, "O Lord, fill this Thy servant whom Thou hast been pleased to advance to the degree of Priesthood, with the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, that he may become worthy to stand unblameably before Thee, to preach the Gospel of Thy salvation." The form at present in the Greek Church is, "A.B. is advanced to the order of deacon or priest; let us pray that the grace of the Holy Spirit may come upon him." I would call special attention to the fact that in the mediæval ordinals, from which ours are chiefly taken, the words, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," are addressed to deacons as well as priests, *e.g.*, in the sacramentaries of Gelasius and Gregory (from which our Prayer Book derives so much), the prayer of benediction for deacons' orders, contains these words: "Be present, we beseech thee, Almighty God, giver of honours, distributor of orders, disposer of offices, pour forth upon those whom we dedicate for the office of a deacon, Thy Holy Spirit, in order that they may be strengthened for the work of faithfully executing their office by the gift of Thy sevenfold grace." So that very generally is recognised the great truth that the essence of preparation for the ministerial office is this gift of the Holy Ghost. I believe that as the Article of the Creed—"I believe in the forgiveness of sins"—fell like a flash of light upon the soul of the Great Reformer, when he first realised its truth, so the words, "I believe in the Holy Ghost," ought to prove a bright ray of light, a charter of hope and promise to the ministers of God's Word and Sacraments. Our Church in this service of Priest's Orders is certainly "strong and very courageous" in the words she selects for the Bishops' utterance. But is not such an example of boldness a useful tonic for our feeble faith, a merited rebuke for our latent scepticism? For what promise is more absolute than that of the gift of God's Spirit, and what office is there that is more after God's mind than that for which we implore it? Let us shrink not, then, from the use of words that assume the petition to be granted as soon as offered: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

But what are the special gifts of the Holy Ghost expected in ordination? For note the words of St. Paul: "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord!" Let us classify the principal gifts of the Holy Ghost enumerated by St. Paul. I shall for my purpose separate them into three divisions.

1. Faith, hope, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, righteousness and truth, meekness, temperance. These are every one of them gifts needed by all Christians.

2. Wisdom, knowledge, power, love—a sound mind. These are, I think, gifts peculiarly needed for the ministerial office.

3. Gifts of healing, working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, divers kinds of tongues, the interpretation of tongues. These are commonly called the *extraordinary* gifts of the Spirit.

Which, then, of these are to be sought for on behalf of a priest or deacon in the Church of God?

1. All those Christian graces which should adorn every truly Christian life, should preeminently adorn his—if he is to be an example to the flock—faith, hope, charity, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness, temperance. Yes; all these are earnestly to be prayed for this day, on behalf of those of us who have already or those who are about to enter the ministry.

2. In addition to these, there are gifts specially needed for the ministerial office—those others, wisdom, knowledge, the being apt to teach — power, love, a sound mind. Every one of these how greatly, how specially they are needed.

3. Lastly, as to the extraordinary gifts. Miracles,

prophecy, gifts of healing, divers tongues, and others. These we do *not* expect; we do not even pray for. They *were* prayed for—they were received in Apostolic times. They have not, with rare exceptions, been looked for in the ages since. Though it is remarkable that within our own century, there has been a revival of the claim in very opposite quarters, *e.g.*, amongst what is known as the Low Church party, and amongst some of the sects of dissenters there has been strongly revived a claim to the "gift of healing," Faith Healing as it is called. Their periodicals have for the last few years been full of such pretensions. Again, in another quarter some fifty years ago, in the foundation of that which assumed the pretentious name of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, under a highly sacerdotal system of ritual, claim was made to the gift of divers tongues. And lastly, but chiefly outside the pale of the Church, there have been yet more notable and ambitious claims made to a revival of the remaining extraordinary gifts of miracles and prophecy. Yet, I say, we do not pray for these; and why not?

1stly. Because their chief value seems to have been evidential, and only sanctioned by God for temporary use when required to meet this necessity. For it would not be well for the world, if always by prophetic gift we could know the future, or if by miraculous power we could evade the operation of the ordinary laws of nature.

I believe that, if these extraordinary gifts became ordinary, a large part of the probationary value of life would be lost, and these rare and exceptional and therefore often much coveted gifts would prove a curse and not a blessing.

2ndly. I may add, as an additional reason, that St. Paul who knew these miraculous gifts well, alludes to many dangers associated with their possession, and urges the Corinthian Christians to covet more earnestly gifts which, in his esteem, were greater and better than these, and that are of imperishable value—such as faith, hope, and, above all, charity.

We have learned then, so far, one very important lesson, viz., that God the Holy Spirit operates in this world in very different ways. I lay stress on this, for it is, I think, often tacitly assumed that when the Holy Spirit of God operates, He must always operate in the same manner and degree, with the same objects and results. But St. Paul denies this categorically when he says, "there are diversities of gifts and differences of administrations;" and I believe that if the force of these words of his had been better realised, many of the controversies which have distracted Christendom would have languished in speedy but not premature decay. If it had been recognised that God's Holy Spirit acts in this world suitably to the capacities, conditions, preparation and requirement of those whom He influences, and that *as a rule* He refuses to give supernaturally that which He has already provided means for attaining naturally; and further if it were allowed that the best method of determining God's probable dealing in unknown cases, is by observing what He has already done in known cases, and not by *à priori* reasoning or from what we imagine we should do if we were in the place of the Almighty; then I say many hasty conclusions, many unauthorised definitions would have been strangled in the birth, *e.g.*, as to Inspiration, when it is said that holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, it would never have been assumed that God necessarily supersedes all man's natural faculties in inspiration, but it would have been seen that the Inspiration would be likely to be such as was adapted to the nature and capacity of the man inspired. Also with regard to Baptismal and Sacramental grace generally—Orders—theories concerning indefectible grace; in fact all the modes of God's operation within the Church, and I may add—God's method of dealing with heathen nations outside the Church's pale—it would have been felt that concerning these we have no right to lay down laws upon which we think the Almighty must act, nor assume that He cannot act at all unless in all the plenitude of His irresistible grace.

We have an illustration of what I mean in the text. The Saviour breathed upon His disciples and said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Did this imply that they had never before this received the Holy Ghost? Scarcely, for St. Paul says: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." Nor could it have meant that they then received all the gifts of the Holy Ghost, for had this been so, Christ would not have commanded them to tarry at Jerusalem till He should send them the promise of the Father, that so they might be endued with power from on high. The gift that Christ gave them when He breathed upon them could not have been either the first regenerating gift of the Holy Spirit, nor the Pentecostal miraculous gift, but must have been some of those peculiarly needful for the ministerial office and for spiritual functions, such as "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord, so that they should not judge after the sight of the eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of the ears," an enlightenment of mind for their sacred office, a clearer appreciation of the significance of the death and resurrection of their Lord.

Thus even to the Twelve Apostles God gave His gift of the Holy Spirit in separate parts and different degrees, and as circumstances and their own gradual growth fitted them to receive it. There were conditions of fitness for reception which God waited for, before He gave of the fulness of the Spirit. It is only of One—even His only-begotten Son that it is writren: "God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him." To all others that Spirit is given by measure, and according to capacity and necessity.

For the reception of the full *ministerial* gifts of the Holy Ghost, what then are the capacities and qualifications required in those who seek the sacred office? The existence of such necessary capacities and qualifications is recognised in our service. For the Bishop first of all addresses the Archdeacon upon presentation of the candidates, and says: "Take heed that the persons whom ye present unto us be apt and meet, for their learning and godly conversation to exercise their ministry duly to the honour of God and the edifying of His Church. "To be apt in learning, to be meet in godly conversation"—these are the pre-requisites for the office of the ministry which our Church directs should previously be enquired into. I would that she had added another which was in the mediæval office. In that office to "scientia, moribus" which correspond to our "learning and godly conversation" was prefixed "natura."

"Natura" "by nature," "by natural gifts and qualifications." For do we not know by experience that certain persons are naturally possessed of faculties of mind or body which predispose them to receive and transmit with peculiar power and facility spiritual impressions. "By nature" (and let us remember in nature as well as in grace, we have God's handiwork) they have readier access to the spiritual world, they more easily realise the things of the unseen world—they have greater endowment for exercising spiritual influence upon their fellow men. We feel that God has made them "by nature" leaders and teachers of their fellows in spiritual things. They are born to be priests and prophets of the people. On the other hand many are not so. In respect to personal power they are as dry bones — quite destitute of that sympathetic spiritual faculty which gives its possessors an electrical influence over men. Now plainly it would be a vast gain to the Church of God, if as far as possible, her leaders were selected from amongst those who at least possessed something of this temperament of power. The possession of it to any great degree must of course ever be a most rare gift. It is only one here and another there who can have it pre-eminently, but a man who has nothing of it, who is naturally cold, unsympathetic, unloving, though he may serve God well in other stations of life, has no calling for the office of priest or minister in His Church, for an office where he shall have ever to be dealing with sinning, sorrowing human beings. The ordination of such a man is in my opinion a calamity to himself and to the people. I doubt not that the recognition of such natural fitness was within the view of St. Paul when he directed Timothy to see that he "lay hands suddenly on no man."

In our service this solemn enquiry is left largely to the conscience of those that seek for orders, being, I think, implied in the question, "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration, to serve God for the promoting of His glory and the edifying of His people?" Something of this natural power of sympathy, as well as learning and godly conversation, ought surely to be required in those whose office under God is to teach, to move, and to comfort men.

We have seen, then, what are those gifts of the Spirit that we invoke to-day. We have seen, also, those qualities which are to be desired in those who would be fit subjects for the reception of those gifts in any full degree, namely, the inward calling of felt sympathy with the work, learning and godly conversation. Each of these, let us remember, God has given us the means to cultivate. We can cultivate a truer, deeper sympathy with our fellow men by earnestly studying their deepest spiritual wants, and devising every means we can to lead them to the only satisfying fountain of God's unfailing supply. We can increase our learning by diligence in the study of Scripture itself, and the employment of the many sidelights which now so marvellously illumine its text. We can grow in godly conversation, for God has not given us the command, "Grow in grace," without giving us the means to obey it.

Be assured that in that parish where there is a priest or deacon who has the inward calling of sympathy with the sacred work; where he is possessed of the knowledge that is so particularly requisite in days of intellectual doubt and perplexity; and where he preaches that most edifying and convincing of all sermons, a holy life, then the gift of the Holy Ghost will not be wanting in manifestation. All that clergy and people will then need will be more faith, a fuller realisation of the words of the Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost," and a large expectation of the manifestation of His Presence.

I selected this particular point to dwell upon this morning, chiefly because I think that without belief in the power of which I have been speaking, the ministerial office is the most discouraging that any one could engage in. Every human effort made will, I am convinced, be employed by the Holy Spirit of God if we really believe in the Holy Spirit; for if we are earnestly seeking to keep God's commandments, we may be assured God will keep His promises. Therefore we are to have faith in His Holy Spirit's operation, though it is often mysterious in its nature, and though it often cometh not with observation. For "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit."

But, on the other hand, if we have no faith in God's Holy Spirit as seconding and using our poor efforts (and that in many ways unknown to us), what a hopeless, heartless work it all is! and how lamentable must be the failure! Oh! therefore, I would say to myself and to my brother clergy, and to those who are to receive either order to-day, let us rise to the level of the utterance of our Creed. As messengers, as watchmen, as stewards of the Lord, let us believe in the Holy Ghost. In our preaching, in visiting the sick, in comforting the afflicted, in seeking the lost, in instructing the young, in the administration of the sacraments, let us look for and expect the co-operating power of the Holy Ghost. In our studies, in our preparation for the pulpit, in private prayer for our own souls and those of our people let us plead constantly for the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. And to you who assemble Sunday after Sunday in this or some other House of God, remember that your purpose in coming—if you come from a right motive at all—is that you may yourselves receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. So esteem the pastor, who may be set over you, as the minister of God's word and sacraments, and of the various means of grace by which the gifts of the Holy Spirit can be increased and multiplied among you. Come not to judge, come not to gaze, but come to hearken to a voice that in all the ordinances of His Church and every spiritual influence says as sweetly and as pleadingly as ever: "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest"; and who also says: "I will pray the Father and He will give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth. He shall glorify Me, for He shall receive of mine and show it unto you." May all of us—clergy and people in our several vocations and ministry be faithful—faithful even unto death, so that we may hear that same voice speaking once more, and saying unto each one of us, "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." God grant this, for Jesus Christ's sake.

QUEEN VICTORIA'S JUBILEE.

BY THE REV. C. B. BRIGSTOCKE, M.A., ENGLISH CHAPLAIN AT HOMBURG, AUTHOR OF "THE MODERN ATHEIST," "LIVING AFTER THE FLESH," AND OTHER SERMONS.

SERMON PREACHED IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH, HOMBURG, ON TUESDAY MORNING, JUNE 21ST, 1887.

"Honour the King."—1 PETER ii. 17.

THE occasion that has brought us together this day is absolutely unique. It has never occurred before within the memory of any of us. In the nature of things it can never occur again.

We meet to celebrate a Jubilee—in other words the fiftieth anniversary of our beloved Queen's accession to the throne of England; an event that has called forth in anticipation much loyal enthusiasm, and that is at this moment stirring the heart of the British nation as it has seldom, if ever, been stirred before.

The celebration is a distinctly religious one. We are called upon—and I am sure we gladly obey the call—to thank God for having spared the life of our Monarch for the last fifty years, for having given her health and strength for the fulfilment of her regal duties, and for having bestowed upon the nation over which she has held the sceptre a period of unparalleled prosperity.

Since the Norman Conquest, that is, during the last 800 years, only three sovereigns have reigned as long as Her Majesty, Queen Victoria—Henry III., who reigned fifty-six years, Edward III., who reigned fifty years, and George III., who reigned sixty years, but none of these could have celebrated such a Jubilee as in the good Providence of God we are permitted to celebrate this day.

At this moment a most imposing ceremony is taking place—one which, for gorgeousness of dramatic effect, richness of historic associations, and sublimity of religious feeling, can not be surpassed. Encircled by her own sons and daughters, themselves holding honoured positions; attended by four of the sovereigns of Europe (the Kings of Belgium, Denmark, Greece, and Saxony), come expressly to do honour to the occasion, and by the representatives of many other Sovereigns unable themselves to be present; surrounded by the peers and peeresses of the realm, by thousands of her subjects, and by representatives of the so-called working classes in whose welfare she has ever taken a profound interest, Queen Victoria stands within the historic pile of Westminster Abbey—stands on the very spot on which half a century ago she was anointed and crowned as Queen of England—stands there as a subject amongst her subjects, a subject of the King of kings and Lord of lords, ready to join with her people in a solemn act of thanksgiving and prayer to Him by whom "Kings reign and princes decree justice," and by Whose goodness and mercy she has so long been sustained and supported.

The spectacle presented by England to the world at this moment is sublime! It is that of an entire nation moved by one common thought—animated by one holy impulse—anxious to express its love and loyalty and devotion to the reigning monarch, and to call down upon her head the choicest and fairest of Heaven's gifts. For the special characteristic of the present celebration is its *spontaneity.* The ceremonial of to-day would lose half its beauty and impressiveness and all its sacredness if there was anything forced or artificial about it—if we were simply complying with some ancient rule, carrying out some ecclesiastical tradition. Feeling is often simulated. It is not so here. There is love on both sides. The Monarch loves her people, and the people love and reverence their Monarch; and to the genuineness and warmth of that love the preparations made for the Jubilee, and the offerings presented to the Sovereign, from the humblest and poorest no less than from the noblest and greatest, have abundantly testified. It appears that the Jubilee offerings from the women of England alone—and these varied from a single penny to a pound, none exceeding the pound—amount to no less a sum than £75,000, and that the contributors to the fund are upwards of three millions. Does not this say much for the feeling evoked and the loyalty felt towards the Sovereign by the women of England, and their appreciation of the way in which she has discharged the varied and often difficult duties of her exalted position?

It is not for me to pass under review the events of the last fifty years. The progress of the nation during that period has been without a parallel in history; so great indeed is it that it baffles our attempts at measuring it. How hard is it for us to realise that when Queen Victoria came to the throne no ocean steamers had crossed the Atlantic, and that railways were a novelty? There was no electric telegraph, the penny postage was unknown, the art of photography undiscovered, and the last traces of Negro slavery had not disappeared from under the British flag. During her reign science has sounded depths which were never sounded before. Education has made rapid strides. Schools have been multiplied so that now there is no excuse for ignorance. Hundreds of new churches have been built; many have been magnificently restored, and the Church of England has never exhibited more vitality—more readiness to deal with the vice and crime of our great cities—than during the auspicious reign of Her Majesty. Mission work has been organised on a scale never before attempted. Missionary enterprise may be described as a *passion* on the part of some of our brethren. The term is not too strong when we remember the effect produced in England in 1885 by the news of the cruel murder of Bishop Hannington in Central Africa. It is a striking fact that within a few weeks of its being known no less than fifty-three young men offered themselves to the Church Missionary Society for mission work; ready, that is, to imperil their own lives in the holiest and grandest of causes. Our Colonies again have been marvellously developed. Commerce has extended in every direction. English ships are now to be seen in every sea, the English language is to be heard in every land, and the present extent of the British Empire is beyond the dream of the wildest visionary. It is literally true, as we all know, that the sun never sets upon the dominions of the Queen. It may not be known that the area of the British Empire is 9,127,000 square miles, and the number of the Queen's subjects is no less than 305,337,000. In other words Queen Victoria holds the sceptre over nearly a fourth of the population of the globe!

And now the question can not but arise in the thoughtful mind, To what are we to ascribe this unexampled prosperity? How comes it that a little island like our own owns possessions and dependencies in distant lands, themselves sufficient to form independent kingdoms? How comes it that England has at her feet a vast Empire like Hindostan, with its many tribes and its millions of inhabitants? How comes it that our thriving Colonies in Australia and North America cling to the mother country and its traditions, and have no desire for complete autonomy and independence? How comes it that Queen Victoria is so worshipped by her own subjects, so honoured and respected by all foreign Powers?

We have no desire to exaggerate or to ignore the silent tendencies of the nineteenth century, and these doubtless are in favour of progress and general enlightenment; but we have no hesitation in expressing our earnest conviction that the present state of the British Empire—I had almost said of the world—its present state of peace and prosperity, is due, under God, in no small degree to *the personal character of the Monarch herself.*

The demonstration of to-day is no demonstration in favour of hereditary monarchy *versus* republicanism, or of parliamentary institutions *versus* the despotism of a single man. On a day like this we have little sympathy with any merely political question. We would rise into a higher and purer atmosphere—the kingdom of the Eternal—and we contend for *character*, *personal character*, as the great factor in this world's history, and as shaping the destiny of its seemingly insignificant events. We maintain the everlasting sacredness of the principle that "Righteousness exalteth a nation."

Never did a wiser or better monarch sit upon the throne of England than the Royal Lady whose Jubilee we commemorate to-day. The nation's demonstration has a strictly personal aspect. The Queen herself is the great central figure, and around her gather on this day our tenderest reminiscences, our warmest sympathies, our holiest aspirations, our brightest hopes. Seldom—perhaps never before in the history of the world—has a Sovereign enjoyed so long and so uninterruptedly the affectionate homage of her people, and so entirely won the love of all classes; nor is it possible to give any other explanation of the fact than this—that she has thoroughly deserved it. In the words of the Poet Laureate we may say:—

> Her Court was pure; her life serene;
> God gave her peace; her land reposed;
> A thousand claims to reverence closed
> In her as Mother, Wife and Queen.

It may be interesting to recall one or two anecdotes about the Queen as illustrating her character at certain critical periods of her history.

One was when she first realised the possibility of becoming one day Queen of England, and this was when she was only twelve. Her governess, afterwards Baroness Lehzen, tells us that on one occasion she put the genealogical table into the historical book, and that the Princess Victoria after reading it remarked: "I see that I am nearer the throne than I thought." "So it is, Madam," replied the governess. After some moments the Princess resumed: "Now many a child would boast, but they don't know the difficulty. There is much splendour, but there is more responsibility." The Princess having lifted up the forefinger of her right hand while she spoke, gave me that little hand, saying: "I will be good. I understand now why you urged me so much to learn Latin. You told me Latin is the foundation of English grammar and of all the elegant expressions, and I learned it as you wished; but I understand all better now," and the Princess gave me her hand repeating "*I will be good.*"

Such words evince remarkable thoughtfulness and decision for a girl of twelve. Some indeed may think that the words, "I will be good," breathe rather the spirit of the Pharisee, and are the fruit of self-confidence. There is no more Pharisaism in them than there is in those words of David that we read so often. "As for me I will walk innocently." (Psalm xxvi.) "I will take no wicked thing in hand; I hate the sins of unfaithfulness; there shall no such cleave unto me" (Psalm ci.); or in that utterance of the God-fearing Joshua: "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." The words are not Pharisaic. On the contrary, they indicate a well-trained mind, able to look beyond the glitter and glory of an earthly crown, suddenly sobered, if not awed, by a sense of coming responsibility, and determined to throw all its energies in the right direction. The Princess could not have uttered a more appropriate life-motto than she did in the words, "I will be good," and her past life attests the sincerity with which she uttered them. She has been good—a good wife, a good mother, a good Queen.

Six years afterwards she became Queen of England, and her attitude then was equally serious, equally thoughtful. Very early on the morning of June 20, 1837, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Conyngham announced to the Princess Victoria the death of William IV., and informed her that she was in law and right successor to the deceased monarch. She was deeply moved by the formidable announcement, and the first words she was able to utter were these—"I request your prayers on my behalf." They knelt down together—and thus the youthful monarch began her reign like the young king of Israel, and sought from the Most High a wise and understanding heart.

The same strength of religious principle has been conspicuous throughout her career. We are told that when a document is brought to her, Her Majesty not only insists upon reading it through, but often asks questions about its details, and has sometimes refused to affix her signature till she has had further time for consideration. On one occasion Lord Melbourne submitted an Act for her signature, and was proceeding to urge the *expediency* of the measure. The Queen stopped him, saying, "I have been taught, my lord, to judge between what is right and what is wrong, but expediency is a word I neither wish to hear nor understand."

Her Majesty has always shown a great reverence for the sanctity of the Sunday. The Prime Minister arrived at Balmoral late one Saturday evening, and said that he had with him some State documents of great importance, and feared that he must trouble Her Majesty to inspect them on Sunday morning. Her Majesty declined to do so, but volunteered to be ready to inspect them early on Monday morning—as early as seven, if necessary.

Personal courage is another estimable feature in the Queen's character. Several attempts have been made upon her life. In May, 1842, some miscreant fired a pistol at her carriage, which providentially missed fire. On the following day the Queen determined to show herself to her subjects, and went out in an open carriage with the Prince Consort. The lady in waiting was surprised that she had not been summoned as usual to go out with her. When Her Majesty returned, her explanation to the lady in waiting was this: "I was determined to expose no life but my own."

But not only is Her Majesty endowed with considerable strength of character, much needed by one holding the exalted position she does, but she has also—what is not always found in combination with it—great tenderness of nature, deep sympathy with all in sorrow, unselfish consideration for others. These are qualities that all can appreciate. and that have endeared her to all those with whom she has been brought into contact. We all know how she visits the peasants in Scotland, and ministers at times to their individual wants. We have all read in the papers Her Majesty's telegrams of touching sympathy at the time of any great calamity, and we know her desire to mitigate in every way the sufferings of her people.

May I be permitted to mention one personal reminiscence of Her Majesty, which will always live in my memory, and which is to me a striking illustration of Her Majesty's gracious condescension and kindly thoughtfulness?

We all remember how the nation was crushed when they heard in December, 1878, of the ever to be lamented death of the Grand Duchess of Hesse, better known as the Princess Alice. I did what I suppose hundreds of my clerical brethren did. I preached a sermon on the death of the Princess Alice. That sermon was published in the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT, and I ventured to send a copy of that sermon to Her Majesty the

Queen. I little thought that I should hear anything more about it, nor had I the smallest right to expect it at such a crisis of overwhelming sorrow and bereavement. What, then, was my surprise and gratification to receive, in January, 1879, a letter from the Marchioness of Ely, and which contained these words :—"Her Majesty desires me to thank you for your kind sympathy, and to say, Her Majesty thinks the sermon very good indeed, and what you said very pretty of the beloved Grand Duchess."

We cannot, my brethren, be too thankful for having had so good a Queen on the throne of England for the last fifty years, nor can our prayers be too fervent that her life may be long spared.

Long let her people share
Here her maternal care,
Long 'neath her smile.
May every good increase,
May every evil cease,
And freedom, health, and peace
Dance round her isle.

Under Thy mighty wings
Keep her, O King of kings!
Answer her prayer,
Till she shall hence remove
Up to Thy courts above,
To dwell in light and love
Evermore there.

* * *

AT the recent levee the Rev. A. W. L. Rivett, vicar of St. Mary's, Barnstaple, was presented by the Rev. R. P. Bent.

THE Chapel Royal, St. James's, is closed until further orders. The Chapel Royal, Whitehall, however, remains open until the end of the month.

THE preachers in the Chapel Royal, Savoy, next Sunday will be :—In the morning, the Rev. Dr. McVickar, rector of Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, U.S.A., and in the evening, the Rev. Dr. Wace, Principal of King's College.

THE Rev. W. H. Metcalfe has resigned the rectory of Everton, near Retford, finding that he holds certain views which he does not consider are quite in accord with the doctrines of the Church of England, and consequently he declines to remain as one of her ministers. Mr. Metcalfe is the patron of the living, and has appointed the Rev. W. Byron Ramsay, the brother of a former incumbent, who has accepted the living.—*The Record.*

ON Friday, the 22nd inst., the Bishop of Rochester sailed for Quebec. He will be absent from England till the middle of October, having received peremptory orders from his medical adviser to take rest if he wished to avert an entire breakdown. The excessive labours of the unwieldy diocese of Rochester, with its population at the census of 1881 of 1,800,000, must overtax the strength of any one charged with its oversight, and all know how unsparingly Bishop Thorold has devoted himself to his duties during the nine years of his episcopate. Archdeacon Burney will act as the Bishop's Commissary, and all letters should be addressed to Messrs. Day and Son, 28, Great George-street Westminster, S.W.

RUPTURE CURED!
IMPORTANT INVENTION.
MR. C. B. HARNESS, the renowned Inventor of Electropathic Belts and other Curative Electrical Appliances, has lately introduced a **new Washable, Everlasting** Truss, known as
HARNESS' XYLONITE TRUSS
A NEW TRUSS. Guaranteed to **last a lifetime.** All who suffer from **Rupture** should wear **Harness' Xylonite TRUSS.** It has a beautifully smooth flesh-coloured surface, of a washable and durable material; gives complete comfort and support without irritation; is cheap, and weighs only a few ounces.
Pamphlet and Advice FREE OF CHARGE on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ld.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JULY 30, 1887.

SPIRITUAL PROVISION IN WORKHOUSES.

WE are very glad to see that the Bishop of Truro, at the recent meeting of the Canterbury Convocation, drew attention to this matter, and moved for the "appointment of a Committee of the Lower House to inquire and report on the amount of spiritual provision which is now being made for inmates of workhouses in England and Wales." In his speech we find that there are 149 workhouses, representing a population of 32,706, in which there is no chaplain. This is a wretched state of things, compared with the spiritual provision that is made for the army and the prisons. Possibly those who have had the management of these things, have felt that there was some truth in the old doggerel,—

> He's only a pauper, whom nobody owns;

and what the Bishop says is only too true as to the absence of chaplains for Union Workhouses. We need only to turn over the pages of the Clergy List, to find that this is literally true. In the county of Cornwall, out of thirteen Unions, there are only *four* chaplains, while in the county of Durham, with its fifteen Unions, there are only *five* chaplains returned.

It may be urged that in many places voluntary effort supplies all the spiritual ministrations that are needed, but we often find that where the work is thus left to chance, little or nothing is done, and it is as important that the souls of the pauper inmates of our workhouses should be attended to, as those of our soldiers, sailors, and even the inmates of lunatic asylums. One great cause of the neglect lies in the fact that this matter does not rest with the Government entirely, but with the local Boards of Guardians; and in many places, in order to keep down the rates, there is a tendency to shelve the matter, trusting to the philanthropy of earnest religious people. And where there is a duly appointed chaplain, the salary given is very often extremely small, in comparison with the amount of work, with the result that the work is often done in a very perfunctory manner, either at the close or before the commencement of the service in the parish church. We believe that we are perfectly justified in saying that Sunday, except so far as it is a rest from out-door work, is as dreary a day as any in the week to the inmates of our workhouses. The service is often read all through, with hardly any singing, and is possibly held at half-past nine, or ten o'clock in the morning, or at two o'clock in the afternoon, so that where religion should gladden, it leaves an "aching void," especially to those who have been accustomed in former days to worship in the House of God in the beauty of holiness. Add to this, the place where the service is held is often not very pleasant—sometimes in the dining hall, where there is the smell of the cooking that is going on in the adjacent kitchens, or else after the dinner, when the smell of the vegetables has not entirely passed away, which is trying to the olfactory senses; this, together with the absence of any provision for kneeling, is very distasteful; and not only so, but the thought in the mind of the pauper is not of the service, but of the things around him and about him.

It is much to be desired that in every workhouse there should be a chapel, either a building or a room set apart for this special purpose, and that the surroundings should, as far as possible, draw the mind away from the things around to those that pertain to the higher spiritual existence, and also that the services should be made as bright and cheerful as possible, and the sermons should be plain and simple. For we must remember that it is entirely owing to accidental circumstances that people are there, and that life there at best is but a dreary monotony. In many rural workhouses the inmates are never allowed out of the precincts, so that they are but prisons in another form; therefore we plead for our less-favoured brothers and sisters, that they should have, at any rate, their Sundays made as bright and cheerful as possible, and that instead of being a day to be got over, it should be the one day in the week to be looked forward to as a day of spiritual joy and gladness.

Further, we think that in addition to the service in the chapel there should be a short service in one of the principal wards of the infirmary on the Sunday; many of the patients are bed-ridden, and cannot possibly get to the chapel service; it is very hard that they who perhaps need it more than others should be left without spiritual refreshment on the Lord's Day. In this work many earnest lay church people might do a good deal. We are glad to see that Lady Brabazon, who is always to the fore in every good work, has urged this matter in a recent letter to one of the Church newspapers, stating at the same time what she has done herself. We trust that her noble example will find many imitators.

We most earnestly hope that the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation will enter into the work with heart and spirit, with the result that those in authority, Local Government Boards and Boards of Guardians, will bestir themselves, and wipe away the blot of the present apparent neglect, and that we shall have every workhouse of any size with its duly appointed chaplain, and the very small ones duly cared for by the local clergy.

THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.—AN EVIDENCE OF REVELATION.

By the Rev. CROASDAILE E. HARRIS.

(*Continued from page* 47.)

II.

1.—Inspiration.

So far an attempt has been made to give a brief and general outline of the argument which may be brought to bear externally for the evidence of the Messianic prophecies on behalf of their Christian interpretation. It has been but an outline, touching merely the outskirts of an exhaustless subject. No attempt has been made to examine the intrinsic worth of separate texts, though a great amount of truth may be gathered side by side with the keenest criticism. The evidence becomes of its own self cumulative, and the direct implication which underlies the chief passages is the most vivid and certain witness to the truth. Christianity was not a new announcement in the mouths of the Apostles. If it had been so, the so-called prophecies of the Hebrew Scriptures would be merely a large dictionary of quotations, in which happy illustrations and anticipations of a vague analogy were found. We therefore resume our thread of the argument, accepting the hypothesis that the Incarnate Personality of God was foretold by the Jewish seers and fulfilled in the birth of Jesus of Nazareth. *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται.*[*] That is to say, the Spirit in the Church understands the Spirit speaking by the prophets. The interpretation by the Church is its own witness, for the only sure and true interpreter must be the Church, the Body whose head is Jesus Christ. That Church gave the Scriptures to her children. The undivided witness of that Church has given the interpretation. Furthermore, her creed has emphatically stated that the third Personality of the Blessed Trinity "spake by the prophets." Prophecy, then, becomes, as an assured fact, a miracle—a definition which we were compelled to accept as the only logical supposition, when discussing the external manifestation of Christianity. Our faith, therefore, is the bulwark which makes the house of prophecy a fortress impregnable, the inner sanctuary of which is the Holy of Holies, from whence have come the inspired voices of holy men, moved by the Spirit of God. Prophecy, however, is more than a mere miracle, or an historical fact of past or present. The Messianic prophecies are the eternal miraculous evidence, whereby he that seeks may find out God—past, present, and future.

---

[*] 2 St. Peter i. 20.

Philosophical scepticism will naturally turn round and show the fallacy of building one's faith on the foundation of a vague doctrine of Inspiration. "Moved by the Spirit of God" is a high-sounding phrase, "of little meaning, though the words are strong" to a calculating critic, whose intelligence can but believe what he touches or sees. It is hardly fair to force the doctrine as an external proof of faith, but the question of inspiration is surely a question essential to the *internal* evidence of Christianity. "God is Law," say the wise, "and all good men are inspired alike," but they are but one step from saying with the fool, "there is no God at all." The believer says, "God is a spirit and He has spoken and in His word there is a vision of Him." It is true he must confess the eye of man cannot see, the ear of man cannot hear. It is true that the Christian can offer no definite theory of inspiration. It would be dangerous, difficult, nay impossible to do so. Butler and Paley, "our legal divines," have not attempted the full answer of the question as to the nature and degree of the inspiration of Scripture. Man will possibly be able to do that when he can exactly define the meeting place of the Ego and Non-Ego. The amalgamation of the Divine and the human is a complex mystery. We must be satisfied with an approximation to the truth. Even if we accept the lowest view of inspiration, our faith can hold its own. Intelligence will take nothing for certain till it is proved. It therefore will not accept such a thing as inspiration till a demonstration compels an acknowledgment. But reason at its best has to be based on hypothesis. If the hypothesis of the existence of God be accepted we showed that there was only one logical conclusion as to the origin of the Messianic Prophecies. God is then not an impersonal influence but a Personal Being. If the hypothesis of the Incarnation be accepted, the Messianic prophecies follow naturally and logically. Jesus is God, and Jesus, as God, spoke by the prophets of Himself. Whatever the question of infallibility of the writers may lead to, the Bible then becomes the Scripture of God, the oracles of God, containing the supernatural revelations made by the Holy Spirit's inspiration to man. Whatever the logical difficulties may be, there is one proof of the inspiration of the prophecies and that is the wonderful harmony between the Word as delivered by the prophets and the work as done by Jesus Christ our Lord.

If the doctrine of inspiration be rejected, the predictive element in the Messianic prophecies must fall to the ground. During the last fifty years there has been a vain, because utterly illogical, attempt to explain rationally, and in other words to disparage the Catholic doctrine of inspiration. The fulfilment is then nothing but "the seeming resemblances of mere outward circumstances." The absurdity of this view is at once shown by the undeniable proof that the predictions are fulfilled in the *exact* circumstances. In fact it is far more probable that many more events than are recorded *formed* the fulfilment of the predictive element of the Messianic prophecies.

2.—MYSTERY.

THE phenomenon of prophecy having been conspicuously exhibited as the inspired truth of God by its incontestable fulfilment in the foundation and settlement of Christianity, the Messianic predictions become natural and full of meaning. The scroll of prophecy lies unfolded, and large and clear shines out the text of the great doctrine of a Messiah, Divine as well as Human. This is the comprehensive inference to be derived from the broadest study; we do not come to the doubtful or merely negative evidence, till we find a theoretical criticism showing us a supposed insufficiency in a particular prophecy. The most logical system in such a case seems to accept the analogy of reasonable inference. Separate prophecies are only portions of evidence; prophecy by itself is only one kind of evidence depending on other like evidences. The mechanical apparatus of grammar and dictionary may tear into shreds a single expression, the full meaning of which may always have been wanting. But the argument from prophecy in favour of the claims of Christ, is not merely dependent on "an adroit manipulation" of sundry quotations; this, we trust, the external evidence has shown. There is, however, a very great difficulty, and an honest one, which must be met by those inquiring for the truth in the realm of the Messianic prophecies—that is, the seeming difficulty which is called *Mystery*. The verifying faculty of man seeks to eliminate from revelation anything that defies an intellectual criticism. The first stumbling-block is usually an incorrect idea as to what a "mystery" essentially is. It is popularly supposed to be the unintelligible contradiction of a confused imagination. But it is not so with the mysteries of religion. By accepting a revelation of religion, one must logically accept the mystery of that revelation. Religion is itself a mystery, incomprehensible from without, only apprehensible from within. A mystery, in other words, is an indirect truth—a true fact hidden, but a fact capable of revelation. The witness of the analogy of science and nature is manifold. Attraction and gravitation are incomprehensible forces. "May we not pronounce, that excluding body, time, space, motion and all its sensible measures and effects, we shall find it as difficult to form an idea of force as of grace?"*

If this be the case, are we to object to a mystery, if so be we find one, in the very secret and spiritual laws of Him Who is "above all, and through all, and in all"? Are we to sweep away the evidence of prophecy, because there may be one little prediction seemingly unfulfilled in Christ the Messiah? This is at least irrational. For this is the determining that the realisation of faith is to be simply arrived at by the extermination of every obstacle. This is but preaching the doctrine of personal infallibility and that is scarcely the basis of truth. When, therefore, we find ourselves face to face with a thought that carries a look of doubt, and when we get our verifying faculty entangled in the meshes of our own calculations, it is scarcely just to conclude that the truth is not there. Truth must be at times paradoxical to us, for we can see but one aspect at a time. If we accept the revelation as being Divine, we have no right to logicalise what we accept as a revelation, and therefore in part as being above logic.

Further, when we remember that the highest thoughts of man are too deep for words, we must accept the truth that the revelation of religion contains depths inexpressible in language.

---

* Berkeley's "Minute Philosopher," Dial 7.

Mystery becomes then an essential characteristic of prophecy. The voice of God speaks in the prophets of the Christ. The Christ cannot be truthfully or fully accepted if the Divine mystery inherent in the Messianic prophecies be not also accepted. "I have yet many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now."

3.—INTERPRETATION.

WHEN the question of the interpretation of the Messianic prophecies is raised, it involves the consideration of many other questions correlative to and inseparable from the great question as to the interpretation of the whole of Scripture. These prophecies must necessarily be the kernel of the whole shell, to a Christian, for it is the interpretation which is at the same time both the paraphrase and the explanation of the written word. To one who is an unbeliever there is practically no successful and virtually no logical interpretation. But if the Incarnation be the lantern, there will be no dark corner of prophecy on which the light may not shine. The light, however, shines as through a prism, and the hues are varied. As there are "theories of inspiration," so there are "difficulties of interpretation." Difficulties no doubt there are, and it has been shown that such there must be. But there are those, who professing to stand within the fold and "calling themselves Christians," have been led to make unlimited conjectures and critical conclusions which avowedly must rank on the side of unbelief. This way out of the difficulties only leads to more uncertain paths. It is well to remember that in a world such as ours the sweetest harmony is made up of the most discordant notes. It is fair, in criticising the book called the Bible, to take the portion and pick it to pieces, but it is not fair to judge the whole by the mangled part. It is fair to criticise the letters, the words, the sentences, to weigh the evidence of history and the broad scope of a hundred arguments—but all this by itself must of itself produce only discord; the keynote of the harmony is left out. The genuineness and authenticity, the state of the text and the wording of the most ancient translations, and the accurate translation and literal meaning of the original—are all subjects of the highest importance and true interpretation cannot exist without them. But the highest criticism cannot forget the wonderful consistency and continuity of the revelation with its supreme idea—the Incarnation. "All things," said Christ, "are delivered unto Me of My Father." Again, when leaving the world, He said, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." And He left His Apostles with the eternal benediction, "Lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." Christ is the centre of revelation. Christ is "the continuity" by which the whole revelation of God holds together.

In fact there is one golden rule for the interpretation of Scripture, and that is to interpret according to the analogy of faith. To take the prophecies and attempt to induce a logical interpretation for the truths of Christianity must end in vague probabilities, empty as thin air. But when faith seizes them for her own, the logical deduction is complete. The interpretation then becomes active in force and the prophecies are applied to the truths. But here caution is needed, for it has been said that the modern scepticism with regard to Messianic prophecy is largely due to the reaction brought about by an excess of preposterous application of unfulfilled prophecy. As to the unfulfilled Messianic prophecies, we can but look as we look at the hazy outline of the everlasting hills from afar, not knowing as yet the beauty and the glory that lies enshrined in their bosom. But in the case of fulfilled prophecy, faith acts as it were as a camera, and the past is photographed indelibly on the focus of the present. Most blessed and profitable becomes the faithful interpretation of and application of those sayings "written of old." It is only in the calmness and high noon of the *spiritual* understanding that the page of Messianic prophecy opens wide and shows forth Him whose "Life is the light of Men."

To those whose materialistic conceptions incline them to a levelling process of criticism, there can be but one answer. Their interpretation is not natural nor is it rational. To interpret the Bible naturally and rationally we must never forget the keynote of the harmony, the one great fact of the book, the Incarnation.

If the fact be true only partially, there is no logical interpretation to be arrived at.

If the fact be not true, there is only one rational conclusion—to reject the whole book. But if the fact be true entirely, the natural and rational conclusion is to examine, interpret, and apply all the contents of the book, and especially those parts involving the fact, in the light of it.

"The Word was made Flesh." This is alone the key to unlock the door of prophecy.

CONCLUSION.

THE evidences for Christianity are manifold and complex. The Messianic prophecies are but a single branch of these evidences; yet so interwoven and intermingled are all the threads, that if one be loosened ever so little the whole texture of the woof will be affected. So indeed to take one evidence and follow its working in and out by itself is more a matter of testing than of proving by evidence. But the remarkable fact about any of the evidences, however examined, still remains the same—that they are absolutely independent in principle—many coloured threads only connected by being woven on one glorious woof—the Incarnation. Even, therefore, when testing one evidence, we must never forget the existence of the others. No single evidence is the chief foundation of Christianity. There is One Cornerstone and on That is built "the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets."

We have tried to show that the doubtful inquirer is met with a mass of cumulating evidence and corroborating testimony in establishing the origin, development and existence of the Messianic prophecies. We have further attempted to show that the believer must read this evidence in a deeper sense. It may have created, at least it must fortify, his stronghold of a natural, rational faith; and as his eyes are opened, the Divine inspiration and the wondrous mystery lend a true light to their interpretation, and the evidence builds itself up as a bulwark of faith.

Again, these prophecies can claim more than many of the evidences. These latter may be called by some only dry historical facts, past and gone; *e.g.*, the life and miracles of Christ were once in the world and are no more. But Christianity points to the miracle of prophecy, *still speaking*, *still existing in fact and development*. The very inmost essence of prediction

—the moral doctrine—is still in the very heart of Christianity. It is, as it were, the stored-up energy which the mystery of sleep gives to a human frame. It is the very force of life which sends the precious blood of Jesus through the manifold arteries of the Church of Christ. "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea."

Though, as said above, prophecy stands not by itself, yet the cogent proof of its Messianic interpretation cannot safely be asserted without independent attestations and distinct reasons.

The only answer to the mere sensualist, whose reason will accept nothing but what is demonstrable, and whose life and existence are therefore logically nothing but a delusion, is that furnished by religion. Faith, the mother of religion, gives the axiom as a basis for deduction. That primary axiom is the existence of God, the Alpha and Omega, the Logos. The proofs must then accumulate—proofs which are demonstrable and not mere conjectures. Of itself prophecy is an inductive conjecture. Prophecy centring in a Messiah, *Messianic*, fulfilled and fulfilling, becomes a correlative demonstration. The minute criticism of analysis must always be a finite attempt to arrive at certainty of knowledge. But *unity* and not disintegration is the great law of life. Analysis of prophecy may give us particles of evidence; it is only the synthesis of the Messianic interpretation which brings the separate individualities into one Divine unity.

The miracle of Divine wisdom in prophecy is a circumstantial evidence for giving the light of faith. But faith is not demonstrated into the soul. Argumentative discussions, fluctuating reasonings and probable views of things cannot give faith. Natural reason cannot bring the soul to the hill of Calvary. Objectively alone, faith comes not. The day must dawn, and the day-star must arise *within subjectively* in the individual soul. "No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost." Faith is the gift of God. He gives it that the soul of man, "being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend what is the breadth and length and depth and height and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge." And while He gives He says, "Ask and ye shall receive; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you." But He must be truly sought with all the heart; the knock must be given loud and unceasing, with the fullest strength and might of the inner man. Then only the word of the Messianic prophecy will lead through itself to God. No subtle skilfulness, no intellectual acuteness is needed. Faith, "the evidence of things not seen," accepts the certain truth of an infallible revelation. If the truth be rejected, revelation is rejected, God is rejected. If the truth be accepted, Faith, the ground of things hoped for, stretches out a gentle hand and leads the wanderer back into His footsteps, who walking on before, crieth aloud,

"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

PREBENDARY ROW is going to lecture on the New Evangel, "The Service of Man," Mr. Cotter Morrison's book, at St. Philip's, Regent-street, Waterloo-place, on Sunday.

BY the death of the Rev. J. B. Deane, the gift of the benefice of the united parishes of St. Martin Outwich with St. Helen belongs to the Merchant Taylors' Company. The living, hitherto worth over £2,000, will now be reduced to £800, and two livings at the east and north-east of London will be increased out of the balance.—*City Press.*

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Askwith, Rev. John Haddon, Senior Curate of Aston; Vicar of Christ Church, Derby.
Barber, Rev. Dr., Master of Ravenstone Hospital, Ashby-de-la-Zouch; General License for the Diocese of Peterborough.
Bartlett, Rev. John Edward Parker, Rector of Barnham-Broom-with-Bixton and Kimberley, Norfolk.
Boville, Rev. J. A., M.A., Curate of West Malling; Vicar of Boughton-under-Blean, Kent.
Charlton, Rev. E. B., Vicar of King's Bromley, Lichfield.
Claris, Rev. George Martin, Licensed to Officiate in St. Michael's Iron Church, parish of All Saints', Wandsworth.
Clarke, Rev. Canon B. S., Vicar of Christ Church, Southport; Archdeacon of Liverpool.
Cooper, Rev. Henry William, Vicar of Haughley, Suffolk.
Cooper, Rev. W. Henry, F.R.G.S., Hon. Secretary of the Church Emigration Society; Priest-in-Charge of the S.P.G. Mission, Kamloops, British Columbia.
Curteis, Rev. Reginald Whitfeld, Vicar of Crowhurst, Surrey.
Griffiths, Rev. Canon G., Rector of Machynlleth; Archdeacon of Bangor.
How, Rev. H. Walsham, M.A., Rector of St. Anne's, Houghton, Denton.
Jones, Rev. Henry Thompson, M.A., Rector of St. Stephen's, Salford.
Kearney, Rev. Michael Neville. M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Stranton, West Hartlepool; Vicar of Harbury, Leamington.
Lodge, Rev. N. B., Naval Instructor to the *Britannia.*
Nelson, Rev. Edward Hamilton, M.A., Rector of Necton, Norfolk.
Newman, Rev. S. J. H., Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Hastings.
Petit, Rev. Paul, M.A., Priest-Vicar of Lichfield Cathedral and Chaplain of Lichfield Theological College.
Ponsonby, Hon. and Rev. Walter William Brabazon, M.A., Rector of Stutton, Suffolk; Rural Dean of Samford.
Sanderson, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Ingham, Lincoln.
Smithson, Rev. Charles Oxley, L.T., Curate of Guisborough; Perpetual Curate of Marton-le-Moor and Dishforth.
Smyth, Rev. Stewart, Vicar of St. Mark's, Victoria Docks.
Stanley, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of St. Anne's, Bowden Hill, Wilts.
Trevitt, Rev. James F., M.A., Curate of Ellastone, Ashbourne, Derbyshire; Rector of Bradley, near Ashbourne.
Tucker, Rev. Barton S., Chaplain to the *Sultan.*
Waller, Rev. Francis Henry, to preach within the Diocese of Manchester.
Williams, Rev. Arthur Julius, M.A., Vicar of Whorlton; Vicar of Ferryhill, Durham.
Wood, Rev. Ernest E., B.D., F.R.G.S., Organising Secretary of the Church Emigration Society.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Coombe, Rev. J. H., Vicar of Cleasby, at Cleasby, on the 22nd inst., aged 76.
Huntington, Rev. John, H.B.M. Chaplain, formerly Chaplain at Leghorn, at Malaga, suddenly, on the 13th inst., aged 67.
Monson, Rev. Thomas John, Rector of Kirby Underdale, at the Grange, Bedale, on the 23rd inst., aged 62.
Murray, Rev. George William, Honorary Canon of Worcester, late Vicar of Bromsgrove, at Kensington, on the 26th ult., aged 80.
Parker, Rev. Edward, M.A., Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral, and Rural Dean, at Oxendon Rectory, Market Harborough, on the 18th inst., aged 78.
Shadforth, Rev. Thomas, Rector of Beckley, and late Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxford, at the Rectory, Beckley, Rye, Sussex, on the 25th inst.
Wagentreiber, Rev. Alfred Henry, Curate of St. Mark's, Broadwater, Tunbridge Wells, drowned on Conway Sands, on the 18th inst., aged 35.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE NEW COVENANT.

By the Rev. Canon PHILIP DWYER, M.A.

Sermon preached at Sydling Church, Dorsetshire, on June 12th, 1887.

"For, by one offering, He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost is also witness unto us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their hearts and in their minds will I write them: and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. Now, where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin."—Heb. x. 14-18.

1. THE manner in which the New Covenant is here presented seems admirably calculated to attract attention, and to hold forth a rich reward to the diligent and teachable. The words are taken from Jeremiah, the great prophet of the Jewish Church. And by their doctors his prophecy had been given the place of honour in the roll of the prophetic records. And the passage itself is quoted twice in this inspired Epistle, once at great length, greater perhaps than in any other citation made from the Old Testament into the New. And on both occasions elaborate arguments are founded with great force of persuasion upon different aspects of matters, fundamentally important to Jew and Gentile alike. And again, our special attention is formally drawn by a direct reference to the speaker in the solemn phrase, "Thus saith the Lord." And further, when we look back at those who toiled so hard and attained so little in their best efforts to master the problems of "the nature of the Gods," and the lines and bonds of virtue. Again, when we look around and find so many groping still in wrong directions, and with such persistent contentiousness, (as though the very noontide of revelation was midnight itself), surely a deepening sense of responsibility should become impressed upon us, as those in whose ears the reverberating voice of an echo was ringing, "Take heed how ye hear." At the same time we must distinguish rightly that other and earlier "Thus saith the Lord," that sounds all along in the many-voiced message set as a glorious choral strain in the open volume of Nature. And whatever truly philosophic suggestions and well marked traces of a law and a Lawgiver are brought to light by the toil of honest thought—must not by any means be overlooked, or made out an object of dread, or tossed aside as useless, when taken in their various measures or appointed ways of working. And yet, after all, natural religion and its most matured teachings are inadequate to meet our needs, and fail just then, when those needs are the most urgent. Natural religion teaches men their responsibilities, and presents to the mind's eye "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world," as well as from its wondrous preservation and order, so that they are "clearly seen." And all this leaves men "without excuse." But nature's utterances, although so instructive, are not uniform. Its summer may sing the glad song of joy and love and life, in strains of sweetness long drawn out. But its winter, with many another changeful showing, and many a dire foreboding tone tells the dread tale of an incomprehensible power allied with an inexorable justice in Him, "with whom we have to do." And all this crushes hearts that are already racked with grief, and forecasts judgments to consciences lacerated by the whips of remorse. We are constrained then, by our very conditions and surroundings, to listen under a sense of self-preservation to every sentence and to every syllable of the other voice of this most gracious "Thus saith the Lord," that is here vouchsafed to us, and to our children.

2. The form also in which this divine pronouncement is cast should also, even of itself, deeply move us. This word is brought "nigh" to us in the nature of "a covenant," which the Lord Himself proposes "to make with them." God had made covenants and inaugurated gracious compacts or agreements—with Noah, Abraham, the Patriarchs, and with Israel also on the Mount Sinai. And here he announces a fresh and final one, bounded only in its onflowings of goodness by the broad, prophetic formula "in those days," and "at that time." And as a matter of fact, this was begun and solemnly entered upon when its terms were duly set forth from the lips of Jesus sitting upon the Mount of Beatitudes. And as the last and most blessed of all covenants divine, it was formally signed and sealed with "water and with blood" shed upon the mount of Calvary from the body of the spotless "Lamb of God," the "Surety of the Covenant." And in all these instances of covenants, the following characteristic features are prominent. There was first a foundation laid in tangible facts addressed to the senses of the parties concerned, so that the senses of the body instead of clogs and weights might serve as airy wings to lift up men's souls to God in the heavens. Then, besides these appeals to sensation, there were also appeals made to reflection upon divine mysteries communicated with a progressive development of revelations ever growing in splendour and spiritual attractiveness. And to crown all, results were brought to light and impressed "with power" in the immediate present as well as for the far-off future, that were "fraught with blessings of infinite worth for every age and race and clime."

3. When the Apostles proclaimed this "New Covenant" in the ears of the Jews as emanating from Jehovah, these objected that all this was an unauthorised innovation, without sanction from Jehovah, nay, in contravention of the law against strange gods and false religions. And in particular, they dwelt upon the fact that the Levitical rites in the Temple and the daily sacrifices were proceeding as of old since the day of their divine institution. And in respect of doctrinal teachings and moral culture, "the Law" was not merely unrepealed, but its provisions were interpreted through the traditions of the elders and administered by the Court of the Sanhedrin.

4. This was a serious and crucial test, and the only way in which the objection which it embodied could be fully overcome, was by an appeal effectually made to principles recognised by the Jews themselves. With them the formula, "He that sweareth to his neighbour and disappointeth him not," rightly held good, and, applied to God's covenants, gave the following results. The covenant of faith and grace made with Abraham was not superseded by the covenant at Sinai, made four hundred and thirty years after, but stood in its essential principles. "The New Covenant" again (though substantially identical with that made with Abraham), was subsequent to the Law given at Sinai. Was it invalid, then; was it a breach of faith? Not so, indeed, but in point of authority it was fully its equal in validity. And for the very good reason that it was incorporated in the Old Covenant, and provision made therein for its proclamation and acceptance. This St. Peter lays down by quoting Moses' prophecy of a prophet like unto himself. This the Voice from heaven ratified, when it said, "Hear ye Him." And the deep reasons for all this are given by Jeremiah after long years of trial, which demonstrated the failure of the earlier Covenant in the two essential conditions, as disclosed in Hebrews viii. and x.

5. The faulty and defective nature of "the Old Covenant" in respect of sacrificial efficacy is accordingly first laid bare. And the exposure is based on the fact of the necessity of repetitions, "The comers thereunto" found themselves "not made perfect," "for there was a remembrance of the sins (the same ones, of course) made again year after year continually." And besides, there was a glaring disproportion between the sacrificial death of domesticated animals and the absolute effacement of moral guilt. Now, this capital defect was remedied in the New Covenant; and accordingly the fact that "it is finished," was not left to be gathered by dubious inference. For, if these (the Saviour's own words of victory upon the Cross), and if His resurrection from the dead suffice not to convince, to satisfy, and to silence every doubt as to the completeness of the offering and the sealing of the covenant, and the book of it, we find here an official proclamation made in behalf of the party primarily concerned, to the effect that "By the one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Nay more, to crown our confidence, it is solemnly added that of this, "The Holy Ghost also is a witness unto us." So then, when the effect of pardon and peace and of a divine oblivion and blotting out of guilt is proclaimed, as not only attainable, but actually attained, it becomes perfectly justifiable in the penitent and believing to argue back from effects to causes in this golden chain; nay more, for all with sins to be washed away and evil to become vanquished, to conclude under an irresistible demonstration and with a "joy and peace in believing," oh, how great, "Now, where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." Here then, as elsewhere, the Covenant is in all things "well ordered and sure."

6. And the like correction of a corresponding defect, in respect of the enforcement of obedience to law (as arising from a merely external promulgation with no corresponding results in good inclinations to meet it) is pressed home in another application at Chapter viii. of this Epistle from the before-cited most precious passage in the same book. This law, under the Mosaic covenant of works, proved an utter failure after long centuries of trial, because it drew forth no harmonious response of willing hearts. And if you may not fully gauge this absolute need of inclination as well as of proclamation, have you not a sad example in what is going on in Ireland. There, among the numerical majority of that unhappy island, the laws of the Imperial Parliament are disregarded, and the Queen's writ doth not run. Nay, under a self-made, unwritten law, not only do these men conspire to regulate their own actions, but also to enforce upon the loyal and the law-abiding an obligation of submission to their behests, while every transgression of these is visited with penal consequences dire and swift as legal sanction alone can make them.*

7. Something more therefore than oft-repeated sacrifices, and an externally promulgated law, is necessary for man, Jew and Gentile alike, as an ample experience demonstrates. And this something more, is to be found through the two grand remedial provisions of the New Testament in the passion of Jesus Christ, and by the power of the Holy Ghost. At the same time this other fact must never be forgotten, that in respect of proclamation of law, there is in the New Covenant a most careful and clean-sweeping away from the law of all the corrupt glosses and crafty evasions, which were superadded since its original proclamation. And these, with the awful warnings of the Lord

---

* Lord Selborne's recent letter enters into this subject in a manner incapable of evasion, and that rebukes all cold disregard. Why also a Criminal Law Amendment Act all for nothing; unless in an issue knit between human savagery versus Divine law and order?

Himself concerning the guilt and doom of those daring to tamper with "one jot or one tittle of the law till all be fulfilled" constitute a standing sanction, to warrant the repeated application of the like purifying process in all time. This is the *rationale* of the Reformation. This turned the pen of Blaisè Pascal into a sword of fire.* This is the life and health of law. And if the Ten Commandments be not each one of them re-promulgated exactly in set terms, our duty to God and to our neighbour has been exactly defined in general form and substantive obligation. Also the second table is repromulgated again and again, commandment after commandment, alike in respect of precept, and in respect of its awful sanctions reserved in His hands, "who is a consuming fire and a jealous God."

8. And here may be restated the great facts and prominent features of this "the New Covenant" of grace and salvation "wherein we stand and rejoice in hope." Under a sacred appointment ordained of God, the whole race of man generally and each member thereof in particular, are included in a welcome back to God "through the death of His Son." He declares that He hath made provision for their re-admission as lost ones into His family under this covenant. And each one of them that "hear" His invitations to "come," has an actual admission into a state of adoption and grace—the Sacrament of baptism as an initiatory rite visibly sealing each penitent sinner "who believeth in Jesus," and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper also visibly resealing all covenant blessings in "the cup of the New Testament" rightly partaken of. And lest this divine sealing and resealing might seem to lack aught of efficacy, or one link seem wanting to each of those who have been baptised as infants (with a vicarious profession of obligations under the New Covenant) a voluntary undertaking for these same to make in person is provided in the Church under Apostolic precedent through the rite of confirmation. Well, then, may each member of the Church say: "The vows of God are upon me," as being at once antecedently bound and binding themselves afresh to every obligation under the New Covenant. "The blood of the Everlasting Covenant" accordingly may well be claimed as "able to make you perfect in every good work to do His will." And must it not also be noticed how that God calls these laws "My laws," and adds: "I will put My laws in their hearts and write them in their minds, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." Time would fail to discourse upon all these wonders of love divine. We only now glance at this matter as taken subjectively. The emotional faculties of "their hearts" and their will itself are kindled as with a live coal off the altar, and kept supplied with kindly light, as the lamps of the sanctuary were fed from streams of purest oil. And "their minds" also are inscribed as with the very "finger of God," until knowledge, judgment, memory, habit, and all the rest become as so many sections of a monumental tablet receiving in letter after letter (graven with ever deepening characters of incisive fidelity) not alone the lines and the letters, but the very spirit and life of law divine. And this goes on in life and time, until "we all with open face beholding as in a mirror (much rather also, holding as in a mirror, because ourselves becoming this mirror) the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord." In the light of all this, what must we say of those who seek to obtrude upon the Church, the following curious perversion (inversion rather), namely, that the one sacrifice that was (because but once offered) declared to be all sufficient for the securing of pardon and peace, must be repeated over and over again, by way of adding to its efficacy and securing its application—a necessity this that would carry back into imperfection what was already made perfect, and mar by a superfluous incompleteness "that which is consummated for evermore." And again, what shall we say of our Confessor who has his penitents persuaded that they are bound to kneel in awe before Him, while he enacts the part of "who shall forgive sins but God alone," ere they can have pardon and peace sealed to their consciences "in the blood of Jesus." And what shall we say of our modern Atheist or modern Secularist? He would either plunge the world into universal lawlessness and deluge it with blood, or else calmly appropriate the high moralities of the Christian covenant, while denying the very being of its Author—outdoing in this the deed of him who robbed the fire of Prometheus, but added not to the wrong of proclaiming his non-existence. And indeed, if such have the courage of their convictions, and would exhibit their case fairly before the world, they are bound no longer to lurk on the confines of Christianity, using its morals as weapons against itself and aiming to release the community from oaths, in which God is called to witness obligations solemnly undertaken by men as having "the fear of God before their eyes." Such parties and their followers ought to start off far away from this Christian nation, and set up an exclusively Atheistical body in some isolated region, until the

---

* We are indebted to Mr. C. H. Collette for the following, which bears upon this subject:—In France, in 1762, a Commission was empowered to report to Parliament upon the works of Moral Theology of the Jesuits. The Commission examined 147 authorised works of this body, setting forth their doctrines, and reported thus: "These doctrines authorise theft, lying, perjury, impurity, all the passions and crimes — teaching homicide, parricide, regicide—destroying religion by substituting superstitions, favouring magic, blasphemy, irreligion, and idolatry," and they "humbly entreat His Majesty to consider what is the uniform teaching and the opinions of the said Society. Made in Parliament, 5th March, 1762." The result was that their books were ordered to be collected and were publicly burned by the common hangman.

world might see how it would look and work in time, much as the Mormons established themselves in the broad valley of the Salt Lake, or the Socialists propose at Sinloa down on the Mexican coast.* And what shall we say of the votary? He, as if not bound already by the manifold ties of the covenant of grace and obligated in heart as one "alive from the dead," must needs rush into the anti-climax of a voluntary submission to some code of doubtful rules, and sport the dazzling distinction of tawdry button or badge of blue or white, or a phylactery hood or cowl to shroud the forehead in token of the vow. Who would deprecate honestly organised and well-meant combinations for real good, however mixed with ingredients of "tolerable silliness?" † But all this goes to the full length of men and women enslaving themselves to men and women when engaged in a "service that is perfect freedom," and thus treating "the blood of the covenant wherewith they are sanctified" as though a helpless "and unholy thing." And what shall we say of the Antinomian fanatic who accounts himself inspired to separate morality from religion, and the Child of a Father whom he in no wise cares to grow like. These are the sickly and sickening vanities of the hour. And they must vanish as the ghosts of night, when "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus makes free from the law of sin and death."

9. And if we proceed to glance at the results to this blessed covenant of grace and salvation alone due, must we not in common justice conclude that whatever else which "eye hath not seen nor ear heard" is preparing in an inheritance incorruptible, yet here now even amid the trials and sorrows of life and time the balance of blessing is found under the covenant, and is altogether in favour of them that cling unto it and keep it; so that indeed "Godliness is profitable for all things." For, what manner of person must not he become who has a full sense of his covenant-Lord as the object of his adoring worship. How purely and direct to the mark must his devotions ascend, who is taught of God as to the manner of worship "in spirit and in truth."‡ How devout and tremulous with kindling sense of love and awe must his heart and soul become, who is filled with the spirit of worship drawn from the third commandment. How may he rejoice and be glad, rest and be thankful, on the recurring Lord's day, into which in honour of the resurrection of Jesus the Jewish Sabbath hath merged. Then, again, if the first table does not unfit us for the duties of the second, but much the other way, so the second table at once develops and educates for the life opened out in the first. But besides all this, every interest that is most precious in life and time is shielded here, and every joy that is the purest is filled from this fountain, so that of every earthly blessing one may truly say, "My Father made and gave them all." How could Government stand or authority act in the Church, the State, the family outside of the "first commandment" with the promise, "Thy days shall be long in the land." And then it puts over us a cord that ties us by the very heart strings with its "And thy mother." Where else the missionary, such as she can be, in her own sweet home mission—she the very divinity of our infancy, at whose knees we learn in lisping accents our first prayers, "God bless papa and mama," and "Our Father which art in heaven"—prayers these that at once establish "order, heaven's first law," in a reign upon earth, and impart the constraints of Omnipotence to the free promptings of love. What, without the sixth commandment, could make life safe from men instinct with the ferocity of the goddess Kali—infatuate monsters, whose ideal of a martyr is associated with the atrocities of a murderer. Last of the blessings of Eden's bowers left to cheer and ennoble man is the marriage estate. How soon must this blessing vanish from a brutalised and blood-stained world, but for the awful seventh commandment of God, with its dread sanctions so swiftly running? Labour, at once the curse and blessing, the joy and sorrow of man, would cease, without the eighth commandment to stand in the way of the nefarious theory that property is robbery—a theory at the root of American Socialism and its Irish offshoot. And need I more than a word to show how the ninth commandment throws a shield over character, the most precious possession of all, the only possession left to some. Not but that this commandment imposes a restriction painful enough to those whose scent of social carrion rivals the acute perceptions of the droning beetle, and who would pounce as an eagle on a lamb, just to keep beak and talons in practice.

Of the tenth commandment one may take an illustration from the corral of the cattle-ranche or the pen in the sheep-walk. Here, just as are gathered up the cattle, great and small, that they neither harm nor become harmed by wandering far a-field; so every evil impulse, every vagrant thought, every first rising of concupiscence that could go forth to sin in act, is imprisoned and restrained within the sanctuary of the heaven-ruled Christian will by "Thou shalt not covet." It is impossible to exaggerate the value of the blessings thus secured to man under the New Covenant. Only he, whose lot of life has been cast among infidel nations or heathen tribes, or where lapsed churches have but added strength to "the overflowing of ungodliness," can approximate even slenderly towards an adequate realisation of the enormous obligations under which the human race is put to the Lord of the New Covenant. And these obligations have respect to the inestimable blessings of authority, our lives, our wives, our properties, our characters, and all that general decent tone of moral restraint which alone makes life worth living, and raises the sons of men above the beasts that perish, or the devils that "tremble." The deist who spoke of Christianity as useful in the way of a police restraint, meant a cutting sneer, but paid a high compliment to that religion which alone enables and befits man for a life amid the humbler conditions of time, as well as for a life in the home of his Father and the city of his God.

---

* See "Social Solutions, No. I." Lovell's Library, New York. † John Calvin's "Tolerabiles Ineptias."

‡ Dr. Newman lays it down in "Development Section Images," pp. 434, etc., "that if the letter of the Decalogue is but partially binding on Christians, it is justifiable to omit such parts as do not apply (*e.g.*, the Second Commandment), and this without intention or appearance of irreverent dealing."

10. If the very kernel and essence of this blessed "New Covenant" is found in God's own law, bear you this also ever in mind, that this same law of God is the very kernel and essence of the religion of the Church of England. Into the very forefront of the noblest of all her offices, the one that brings us nearest to our Father in Heaven, the Communion Service, she has restored the Ten Commandments, nailed them to the mast to fly for her colours, as one may say—let her sink or let her swim. These in thousands of her churches are printed with letters of gold on tablets that take the glance of every eye. While in every one of her churches, in the same solemn service, "The priest, turning to the people, shall rehearse distinctly all the Ten Commandments, and the people (as in no other religion that I ever heard of), shall at the end of each commandment say, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law"; and after the tenth, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and write all these Thy laws in our hearts, we beseech Thee." Also, "every child baptised shall be taught so soon as he can learn, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer in his own tongue." And thus the young are trained, the old are bound, and all alike are brought within closer range of and into magic touch with the blood of Jesus and the power of the Holy Ghost, in the new covenant of grace and salvation. And all this accords with, and why not also our pulpit teachings accord as well, with the cordial enforcement, never to be withheld, of the two grand provisions of the covenant, wherein we have our justification by faith in the blood of Jesus, and the sanctification of our lives by the blessed Spirit of our God. And we must add, that as this is the religion of the Church of England, so this is the Church and this is the religion (and none other) with which England as a nation has solemnly contracted to unite itself—one Church and one nation, as man and wife are one. "Happy are the people that are in such a case, blessed is the nation that hath the Lord for their God." In the Church of England are numbered some 14,000,000 of members, and some 25,000 of ministers. Now if "this law" which God calls "His law," and which is "holy, just, and good," were put into the hearts and written upon the minds of each and every one of all these millions and thousands of souls (and their own sole fault it must be for all this not so to be), what an England (glorious and great as she is) would she not then become. What a Court, what a Parliament, what cities, what towns, what villages, what factories, what farms, what ships, what homes, what a noble army, what a royal navy, should we not see. Nay, but these latter no more than police and judges and gaols, perhaps, and even hospitals as well, might not be required any more, nor any place for them found in the blessed land of them that "fear God and work righteousness." But instead, what schools, what colleges, what universities, what churches, what life and power in our services, in our sermons too, what joy in habitual daily prayer in the closet and in church, what crowds of candidates for missions, what vigour and breadth and depth of mission workings and awakenings. How should we not list to the sweet cadences of Psalm and Hymn poured all abroad, as chimes of bells that sink and swell o'er hill and dale. A Jubilee year indeed it were then, and every year, and every day, the same in world rejoicing, world blessing, soul enriching, love-abounding harmonies and happiness. And yet here again also, all this must be estimated with an abatement (not as bearing upon results which admit of no abatement), but only of those instrumental agencies for good, that are now intermediately operative in this great work of the New Covenant. Thus, if agencies connected with attempts to put a stop and stay upon evil shall have no place or work to do, equally so agencies connected with the spread of divine knowledge and the growth of things spiritual may just as well be made to stand aside. And of these there may be even such as, spiritual pastors and masters, and the more formal ecclesiastical organisations, and even higher things still, which now we justly prize and profit by in the present stage of the Christian era. And all this shall be because of the Most High intervening directly and to a degree unknown as yet to the Church, and unguessed even by the hopeful. "In those days," and "at that time," towards their sunlit close, amid the harvest-tide of grace and the vintage of glory—the solemn assurance is passed that then, not of the scattered remnant, but of the gathered people Israel, "They shall not teach every man his neighbour and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for all shall know Me from the least to the greatest, for I will be merciful unto their transgressions and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." Now, whatsoever from all this may be the aggregate result in blessings to England, the Catholic Church, the cause of God, the Saints of the Most High—one thing is clear, and it is this, that these blessings are neither forced upon any nor shared to the full by them that refuse them. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin, in them and

in them alone on whose hearts and consciences it is sprinkled. And vastly beneficial as are Christian moralities, and their effective play most beautiful in our midst, "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." We must draw nearer to God than "the mixed multitude" that went up with God's people, nearer too than them "who fell in the wilderness." And now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God, our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.

◆

LOYALTY.

By the Rev. G. JANNINGS, M.A., Rector of Warmsworth, Doncaster.

Sermon Preached at Warmsworth, on Sunday, June 26th, 1887.

"Pilate therefore said unto Him, Art thou a King then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a King. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."—St. John xviii, 37.

WE are met together as a congregation and as a people to-day, on a very remarkable, on an all but unique occasion. Only once before has such a commemoration taken place in the history of the English nation, when, in the year 1809, just seventy-eight years ago, the rare event of a king of England having entered upon the fiftieth year of his reign was celebrated in the month of October (the month of King George III.'s accession) as a national jubilee. Only two other kings in the annals of our ancient monarchy (before the time of King George III.) have sat for fifty years upon the throne of these realms, and it is a singular fact that in each of these three instances the sovereign was the third of his name. In the case of Henry III., this country in the fiftieth year of his reign, 1266, had long suffered from the miseries of civil war, the last battle of a long war had just been fought. It was no fit time, therefore, for thanksgiving and rejoicing, even if (at that early period) such an idea would ever have been entertained. In the other instance, that of Edward III., the fiftieth year of *his* reign was also the year of his death. And if we compare the state of things now, in this jubilee year of our present Queen, with that which existed on the only former similar occasion of which history makes mention, we shall see abundant cause for returning thanksgiving to Almighty God for the completion of the fiftieth year of Queen Victoria's prosperous and beneficent reign. But here the question may arise, on what principle is it that the fiftieth, rather than the fortieth, or a still more lengthened period than either, should be considered as a fitting time for such a commemoration as this which we are now celebrating? It is not merely because the period exactly divides the century, nor is it only because a reign of half-a-century is a remarkable occurrence in our national history. The commemoration has a scriptural foundation and origin. I scarcely need to remind the reader of the Bible that amongst the Israelites the fiftieth year, by God's express appointment, was a year of jubilee, a time which for very solid and substantial reasons was a year of great rejoicing, as the word itself denotes, being derived from the Latin word *jubilate*, which means "rejoice ye."

Now it was mercifully ordained by God in the law of Moses, that in the year of jubilee every Israelite should recover the possession of his patrimony, or of his freedom.* Every Israelite in that year recovered his right to the land originally allotted to the family of which he was a member, if he or his father, through poverty or other causes, had parted with it. And in all such cases of sale, the price was regulated by the consideration of the number of years which had to run before the coming of the next jubilee.

All Israelites also who had become bondmen, either to their countrymen or to resident foreigners, were set free in the year of jubilee. And Josephus says, although there is no mention of this in Scripture, that all debts were also remitted. This may have been an outcome, in subsequent times, of the liberal spirit of the year of jubilee. The year was inaugurated by the blowing of trumpets throughout the land, and by a proclamation of universal liberty.

Regarded in a social and political point of view, the jubilee was calculated to remedy some of the evils which inevitably arise in human society, to prevent the accumulation of inordinate wealth in the hands of a few, and to relieve those whom misfortune had reduced to poverty. Whilst looked at in a higher point of view, it was a standing prophecy to the devout Israelites of that spiritual jubilee which was to come, in which every true son of Abraham, every true believer, whether Jew or Gentile, would become the possessor of a glorious inheritance, and would be endowed with a freedom which could never be taken away from him. This, then, is the ground of our rejoicing to-day. It is owing, I mean to this ordinance of God, in the history of the Jews, which has caused the fiftieth year to be regarded as a fitting time for especial rejoicing, whether in the annals of a family or of a nation, as, *e.g.*, in what we call a golden wedding, or in the case of the fiftieth anniversary of the accession of a king or queen.

Old Testament traditions and customs such as this observance of the fiftieth year, and that of the seventh day as a day of abstinence from pleasure, and of rest from labour, have had more weight with us than with the other nations of Europe. We too, as a people, especially since we threw off the yoke of Rome and became a Protestant nation, have shown much sympathy with the Hebrew race. So far from being subjected to oppression and persecution as they have been on many occasions, even in the present day, in various parts of Europe, we have recognised their claim to equal rights and privileges of citizenship with ourselves, and have even admitted them within the walls of the national parliament.

---

* *Vide* Smith's "Dic. of the Bible."

The idea has been entertained that we are the descendants of the lost ten tribes, who were carried captive by the Assyrians, and certainly the marvellous increase and prosperity of the Anglo-Saxon race and the evident tokens of divine favour which have been showered upon it, are not the least weighty of the arguments by which that theory has been upheld. Whether that supposition be well founded or not, I do not feel myself competent to decide, but in any case there can be no doubt that the divine favour and blessing have rested upon us as a people in a most remarkable manner, and that is a consideration which may well be present to our minds to-day—when we are commemorating, by an especial service of thanksgiving, the jubilee year of our present beloved Queen. We have great cause to thank God for the progress which has been made in science, in knowledge, in the arts, and material advantages of civilised life, and above all in religion and morals during the past fifty years. Who that can remember the squalid condition of our churches, and the slovenly manner in which the service was often conducted, and the slender interest which was generally exhibited by both clergy and people in the rites and ordinances of the Church fifty years ago, cannot but see cause for thankfulness in the improved state of things, in that respect, which now exists.

Nor are we giving God thanks to-day merely for the fact that Queen Victoria has completed the fiftieth year of her reign, but also because she has reigned nobly and well; because she has set a good example to her people in all the relations of life, as wife and mother, as well as a widowed queen, and has made her court a pattern of purity and virtue; she has also endeared herself to her people by her ready manifestation of sympathy with all classes of her subjects, whether rich or poor, under circumstances of peculiar or widespread sorrow, whilst in matters of state policy she has displayed a degree of tact and practical wisdom which mark her out as being eminently well qualified to be the sovereign of a free people, she has always exercised extreme moderation in the use of her legitimate powers, and has never so much as attempted to stretch the royal prerogative beyond its constitutional limits. And hence the monarchy, under which it is our happiness to live, gives full scope to the generous sentiment of loyalty, and at the same time secures for us all the advantages of popular government.

And truly a grand and refreshing spectacle has been presented by the people of this country during the past few days. Such a display of loyalty as has been everywhere exhibited, augurs well for the stability of the Constitution and the Throne. The scene, which was enacted in the Metropolis on Tuesday last, may well make those who hear of it, still more those who witnessed it, proud of the name of Englishman. The heart of the nation has been moved, not so much by the magnificence of the spectacle and by the splendour of the retinue which accompanied the Queen on her way to Westminster Abbey, to give thanks to Almighty God for His mercies, as by the piety of the act itself, and by the combination of queenly grace and majesty and of womanly tenderness which was manifested by the principal actor in the scene, on that great occasion. And we can well imagine that intelligent foreigners who may have been spectators of that sight would be ready to exclaim, "Surely this great nation is not only a mighty, but a wise and understanding people." It is above all the acknowledgment of God which has made England great. And it is surely some encouragement under the depressed state of trade and agriculture from which the country has suffered so severely and so long, to see that feelings of regard for religion and of loyalty to our good Queen are still so strong amongst the great mass of our people.

There are those who tell us (and in some such cases, perhaps, the wish is father to the thought) that we are drifting, not only towards democracy, but towards republicanism. The events of the past week afford a very strong indication that such a system of government is contrary to the genius, and would not be in accordance with the wishes of the English people. There would be no field under a republic for the generous enthusiasm which has just been evoked from the hearts of all classes in the land.

There could be no such thing as a feeling of loyalty towards a Congress or a Parliament; it must needs be centred in a person. Neither could there be elicited towards a President of the State, who only holds office for a short period, any such sentiment of loyalty as that which the English people entertain towards the person of their hereditary Sovereign.

And this feeling of loyalty to the head of the State is not merely a sentiment. It not only calls forth generous emotions; it does much to promote the common good.

Amid all the differences which divide us into sects and parties on various other questions, the Throne is a centre, around which all classes and persons of all shades of political and religious opinion can rally.

Loyalty to one who reigns, not only by the right derived from a splendid regal ancestry, but who reigns also, as Queen Victoria does, in the hearts of her subjects, is a bond of union which gathers together in one, not only the inhabitants of the British Isles, but also English-speaking people, who are separated by the wide ocean from us, and it is hardly too much to say that the good government of our Empress-Queen tends to reconcile a vast population of another race and language and creed (I mean, of course, the millions of the great continent of India) to English occupation and rule.

We do well, then, we have good cause to offer up to Almighty God our united praises and thanksgivings, that He has preserved to us so long a Queen who has done so much, by her personal character as well as by her exalted rank, to hold together by the bond of loyalty the various inhabitants of her enormous empire.

And not only is loyalty to the person of the Sovereign a mark of a generous and high-minded nation; not only does it act as a common tie, which unites as one people those who differ in race and creed, and who hold in many other respects antagonistic views,—it is also the type and the counterpart of a higher allegiance which we owe to a greater than any earthly prince, even of loyalty to Jesus, who is the King of kings and the Lord of lords.

When Pontius Pilate said to the innocent Prisoner who stood at his bar, "Art thou a King then?" Jesus answered, "Thou sayest that I am"; meaning, of course, "I am that which you say—a King! To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth."

It is well to show loyalty to an earthly Sovereign, but it will profit us little if we are disloyal to the King of Heaven.

It is our boast that Britons never will be slaves. The emancipation of our slaves is one of the grandest acts of our national history. It is one of the glories of English rule that even a born or a purchased slave who sets his foot on British territory is from that moment free. But to little purpose do we boast of our personal and political freedom, if we know nothing of the liberty wherewith Christ makes His people free. We all want freedom and deliverance from the despotic rule of our own corrupt affections. We want power to say no to every wrong desire, to every unlawful appetite, and this is a power which Christ alone can give us. If the Son of God makes us free, then shall we be free indeed. That man is a king who reigns over himself. Would that we might all of us seek this true, this holy and perfect freedom.

Would that we might all be led of our own free choice to take service under the banner of Jesus, the true King of men, and fight manfully under His leadership the good fight of faith. For then we shall have our part in that glorious Jubilee which will be ushered in "with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God." Then, indeed, shall we see the King in His beauty, and He will acknowledge us as His own, and will "make us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign for ever and ever."

RHEUMATISM, GOUT,
SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, INDIGESTION, CONSTIPATION, LIVER & KIDNEY COMPLAINTS, NERVOUS DISORDERS, LADIES' AILMENTS, ETC. Promptly Relieved and CURED BY
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT
ALL sufferers should read "Harness' Guide to Health," free by post, containing copies of **Thousands of Testimonials.** Every man and woman in search of **Health, Strength,** and **Energy,** should at once send a **21s.** postal order to the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.** **52, OXFORD ST.** LONDON, W. and procure one of these famous Belts, and they may rely upon being
CURED
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 1887.

PARTIES AND PRINCIPLES.

RARELY has any party leader been confronted with difficulties so numerous or various as those which have been suddenly raised before the present Prime Minister. On the one hand, he leads a party united mainly upon one question, namely, the maintenance of the Union; and on the other hand, questions upon which fundamental differences exist in the various sections of the party are constantly arising and pressing for solution. Hence a few of the least influential of the Unionists are openly boasting that they could, if they chose, overthrow the Government—which nobody doubts for a moment. It is always in the power of a comparatively small number of people to overthrow a Government, if they can bring themselves to the performance of an act of treachery, just as it is always in the power of a single member of a crew to scuttle the largest steamship. But if there exist any such persons in the Unionist Party, we would have them reflect upon two matters—first, that they are pledged before the country as well as their own consciences to do nothing to weaken the Government as a Unionist Government; and secondly, that to force Lord Salisbury's hand in regard to points upon which differences exist would inevitably lead to the disruption of the Unionist Party, and open the way for Mr. Gladstone and the Home Rulers. We know it is said that an even stronger Unionist Government than the present might be formed, but the argument is like the creed of the Anarchists, according to which chaos is a necessary preliminary to the re-establishment of social order upon a new and better basis. The fact is that if the Union is to be maintained, almost everything else will have to be sacrificed for the present. For the first time in English history it is justifiable to make some small sacrifice of principle to expediency, for the particular principle supported by the existence of the Unionist Party so far transcends all other principles in importance and preciousness, that they must be put aside as of no account whatever. The temporary sacrifice of Conservative or Radical opinions or of ideas identified with particular parties in the past, for the sake of keeping together a party pledged to the Unionist principle, is the demand which the dangers now threatening the Empire make upon all patriotic men. There has been a great outcry because Mr. Chamberlain has postponed the Radical programme with which he started; because Mr. Goschen has taken a seat in the Unionist Cabinet; because Lord Salisbury has relaxed his resistance to any interference with the judicial rents. But these are sacrifices of minor principles for the sake of the greater. They are precisely the kind of cargo that has to be thrown overboard if the Unionist ship is to be kept afloat. We affect no surprise at them, and are quite ready to believe that even now other modifications may yet be proposed. Of course, it is easy to show that the course taken by the Unionists is opposed to theoretical systems of ethics, and to sneer at it as inconsistent, unprincipled, and opportunist. But the fact is that ordinary rules do not apply to an emergency like the present. When we are suddenly confronted with what is believed to be a great and imminent national danger, all obligations save those of the broadest patriotism vanish. Sacrifices which would in ordinary times shock the moral sense are made not only with alacrity but with a sentiment of right doing. To recur to the illustration we took just now: no captain is justified in throwing cargo overboard unless it becomes necessary to save the ship and the lives of her crew; and there is ample justification of that kind for the sacrifices which are being made by both the Conservative and the Radical sections of the Unionist Party. It is retorted that the motive is the ignoble one of keeping a hold upon office. That is true in so far as the possession of place is a means to an end. Sir George Trevelyan was by no means wholly wrong when he charged the Unionists with being actuated mainly by the object of keeping Mr. Gladstone out of office. The present Government is essentially an anti-Gladstone Government. It recognises in the policy advocated by Mr. Gladstone an immense national danger, and the various sections of the Unionist Party regard him as a common enemy.

THE Dean of Hereford has been appointed Master of St. Ethelbert's Hospital, in succession to the late Lord Saye and Sele.

TRADE UNIONS AS FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

THAT most of the great trade unions of the country are unsound, so far as their engagements to pay sick and superannuation benefit to their members are concerned, is generally believed. They were established on the threefold basis of obtaining for their members new trade benefits to which they might conceive themselves entitled, of defending such benefits or privileges as they already enjoyed, and of providing against the ordinary calamities of an artisan's life, including want of employment. No one will dispute the efficiency of trade unions as fighting engines; but it is a great pity that all the sacrifices they have called forth, all the money they have absorbed, have not sufficed to secure their members against sickness or old age, when half the money contributed would have sufficed for the purpose on ordinary assurance principles. The protection of trade interests ought to have been kept distinct from purely provident arrangements, with their delicate financial bearings and obligations extending far into the future.

These remarks have a special application to a report—very noteworthy in more than one respect—which Mr. John Burnett has drawn up as labour correspondent to the Board of Trade. Mr. Burnett was formerly the organising secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers; and even in this official report he claims leave, on account of his former connection with trade unions, to speak with great freedom of opinion, "whether strictly in accordance with official etiquette or not." Certainly Mr. Burnett has not erred on the side of a too pedantic regard for punctilio, and it would be easy to point to instances in which his bias has clearly put him wrong; but for all that his report is valuable and suggestive.

The point now to be discussed is the position filled by trade unions as friendly societies. We find that in no one of them is the weekly contribution divided into two payments—the one for the protection of the trade, and the other for the provident fund. The whole contribution goes into a common treasury, out of which come strike pay, sick pay, non-employed pay, funeral pay, and superannuation pay. No calculation is made as to the proportion of the contributions which ought to be put to the provident account, and no separate allocation of funds to that account is made. Whatever demands arise, they are met out of the common store; no attention whatever being paid to the question whether the balance in hand and the assured revenues will suffice to meet all existing liabilities. Hence the unsoundness of trade unions as provident institutions. Their business is conducted on a hand-to-mouth principle such as no prudent workman—least of all a member of one of these societies—would be guilty of individually. Read Mr. Burnett's description of the system :—

> As a rule the contributions of the chief societies are fixed at 1s. per week; but if at any time this payment proves insufficient to keep the funds of the organisation up to a minimum fixed by rule, the contributions are increased to such a figure as is deemed sufficient to so maintain the funds. In this way, and at different times, the subscriptions of the members of some societies have for lengthened periods reached as high as 2s. 6d. per week. Special levies are also occasionally made to provide extra assistance for members in exceptional distress, for members on strike, or for other trade societies who require help.

In other words, a man who thinks of joining a society is told that his contribution will only be a shilling a week. But after a while the funds drop to a certain sum per head of the members; and then the council have power to make a special levy to any amount which may be necessary to bring the funds up to the required figure. Then a strike breaks out and another levy is made; while special levies are also ordered for various charitable and other purposes. Thus the shilling contribution has not infrequently to be doubled or trebled.

A glance at the statistical tables in the report shows the condition of affairs. In practically the whole of the eighteen great societies whose accounts are here exposed, expenditure habitually exceeds income; while the amount of contributions per head of the members has steadily risen. Not one of these societies could be wound up paying 20s. in the pound, save by making a heavy call upon its members. Mr. Burnett, to do him justice, does not disguise the truth. He points out the full meaning of these special evies:—

> The figures as given do not show the full effect upon the members who pay. The amount per head is calculated upon the gross membership, whereas the contributions are paid only by the members who are not on any of the societies' benefits, members on benefit being exempt. It will thus be seen that the increased payments fall at a time when members are least able to make them, when there are fewest members to pay, and when many leave the society rather than meet the difficulties of the position. Nevertheless, even in times of the sorest trial, it will be found that the vast bulk of the members of these societies have stood the test and responded bravely to the calls made upon them.

Bravely, no doubt, considering that in some cases, even where the membership is large, the annual total of the contributions per head amounts to £3 and upwards, while £2 per head is not uncommon; sums which represent a tax of 3 or 4 per cent. on the wages of the average skilled workman. Indeed, as the tax is paid only when members are in work, and as there is always a considerable proportion out of work, the percentage must be even higher.

Now, for £3 a year a man of twenty-five can assure £150 at death from any cause. He can assure £1,000 at death from accident, and sums varying from £1 to £6 per week for total or partial disablement from accident. He can assure more than £100 payable to him on reaching the age of sixty, or payable sooner in the event of death. Payments of £3 a year for twenty years would entitle him, at the age of forty-five, to an annuity of £6 for the rest of his days. But what does this payment to the trade union give him? Primarily the right to work, of which otherwise the union would deprive him. Secondly, such advantages in his relations with his employer as arise from the command of large sums of money, which those who hold it may spend pretty much as they please. Thirdly—and this is the important point—his £3 a year procures for him promises of help in time of need, of sickness, and old age, in which it is impossible to have confidence. So long as levies can be squeezed out of the members, so long will the societies be able to carry on; but the collapse is sure to come sooner or later. Members of friendly societies grow old like other people, and the superannuation burden always tends to increase. Says Mr. Burnett:—

> The superannuation benefit is undoubtedly the one which these societies will ultimately find most difficulty in maintaining, as in the case of old-established societies in which this benefit has always been in existence a steady increase in the number of claimants is year by year exhibited. At present any danger from this source is provided against by the expedient of levies and augmented contributions when the general funds fall below a certain amount; but it is becoming now a question of much interest to these societies as to whether some method can be devised of placing a fund for this purpose on a more permanent basis than at present exists.

This is not only a question of much interest but of imperative duty, unless the greater part of the 600,000 members who are said to belong to these societies are to suffer—they or their successors—the misery of disappointed hopes, misplaced confidence, and unmerited privation.—*St. James's Gazette.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL ON THE BENNETT CASE.

SIR,—It has been again and again asserted that adoration is allowed by the Privy Council in the case Sheppard *v.* Bennett. It is well now to give its words on that subject, so as to set the matter at rest for ever. I quote from Brooker's "Six Privy Council Judgments," p. 243. "Some of their lordships have doubted whether the word 'adore,' though it seems to point rather to Acts of Worship, such as are forbidden by the 28th Article, may not be construed to refer to mental adoration addressed to Christ spiritually present in the Sacrament, which does not necessarily imply any adoration of the consecrated elements, or of any corporal or natural presence therein." "Christ spiritually present in the Sacrament," evidently means the second Person of the Trinity present by His Deity in the service. But the sentence goes on, "Upon the whole their lordships, not without doubts and division of opinions, have come to the conclusion that this charge is not so clearly made out as the rules which govern penal proceedings require. Mr. Bennett is entitled to the benefit of any doubt that may exist. His language has been rash, but, as it appears to the majority of their lordships that his words can be construed so as not to be repugnant to the two passages articled against them, their lordships will give him the benefit of the doubt that has been raised." The sentence then quotes Dean Jackson: "What need, then, is there of His bodily presence in the Sacrament, or of any other presence than the influence or emission of virtue from His heavenly sanctuary into our souls?" This was all they sanctioned, and they gave Mr. Bennett credit for meaning no more. So that matter is closed for ever.

2. It has been said that Transubstantiation is a philosophical or metaphysical, and not a theological dogma. This must mean that our senses are not capable of theologically asserting that the accidents must necessarily accompany the substance. But if not, we have no proof that our Lord's risen body was a real body, much less the same body that suffered. By ignoring such decisions as those of the Athanasian Creed, the Black Rubric, and the 4th and 15th Articles, we deprive ourselves of all theological dogma, and make Christianity a system invertebrate without any backbone or outward form. It is easy to get rid of our Creeds as metaphysical; but this leads to the conclusion that every one may believe exactly as he likes, and then *cui bono* any revelation at all?

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can and V.-G. of Kildare.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." August, 1887. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

IT is not so good a number of the *Expositor* as usual. Professor Godet's paper on the Epistle to the Philippians, which he calls "The Thanks of an Apostle," is thin and poor; and Dr. Maclaren, on the Epistle to Philemon, is not by any means at his best.

Much the most useful paper is Canon Westcott's, on the "Revised Version of the New Testament." Any student who will read this paper with his Greek Testament before him, and will also refer to Trench's "Synonymes," and read what is there said on the meanings of such words as are noticed in Canon Westcott's article, will certainly learn much.

Professor J. A. Beet's paper, "Crucified, and Risen with Christ," is an exceedingly elaborate examination "of a group of phrases familiar to St. Paul, and including the words, *crucified*, *dead*, *buried*, *made alive*, *risen*, and *sitting in heavenly places*, *with Christ*." It is very elaborate, we say; but then St. Paul did not draw Acts of Parliament, but wrote letters, at different times, to different men, for different reasons. St. Paul did not use a particular word or phrase, and then note it in a Precedent Book for future use. Because they will not remember this, commentators make most learned blunders; they study the words only and forget the man, instead of interpreting the words by the man. It is a paradox—although we know little of St. Paul except from his letters, yet we cannot *wholly* understand the letters until we have understood St. Paul himself—but it is true. Professor Beet's article is most able, and we thank him for it; but his conclusions are commentator's conclusions, and we decline to accept all of them.

"A MODEST INQUIRY AS TO CERTAIN DIFFICULTIES CONNECTED WITH THE MYSTERIOUS PRESENCE IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST." Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.

ONE of the distinctive features of the times is the revival of worn-out controversies. Among these, is that concerning the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament. This movement is made from within and not from without. And it proves that the party of reaction are full of energy, when they not only would force their theories upon the Church of England, but even upon the Church of Ireland also. And their mode of dealing with those who hold the old true faith is quite as disingenuous as their treatment of Scripture and ecclesiastical standards. All who differ from them this party excludes from their organs, such as the *Church Times*, and now, the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*. So that the faithful had to work out their demonstrations in an Irish secular paper. Among those who fought this battle is the venerated Canon Crosthwaite, who now sums up the main points of the controversy in a pamphlet entitled "A Modest Inquiry." This work is in many ways valuable, and particularly as showing up how the ritualist and sacramentarian conclusion is arrived at by a deceitful handling of the Word of God. And this is traced out in a number of particulars with great skill and moderation, also in the fewest words and by the most logical methods. Indeed, if the words "this is my body" be detached from the rest spoken at the time, also from the occasion, the speaker, the hearers, and besides from all the other matters bearing upon the subject elsewhere recorded in the Scriptures and exhibited in centuries of Church controversy, that are utterly subversive of the conclusion claimed, we have thus presented an infallible receipt, which, if applied to other controversies, would settle them off quickly enough. Of this Dr. Whateley gave a choice specimen in his jocose, logical sharpness. "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," he said, mean one thing, but "hang all the law and the prophets" mean quite another thing. And so in this controversy as well, where sentences are maimed and Scripture tortured. And the manner in which the writer deals with the methods of rationalistic Church defence, forced into the Irish Revised Prayer Book, deserves study, and will repay careful thought. On the whole, they who need a learned exposition of an intricate controversy, by the masterly hand of a scientific theologian, ought to purchase, study and circulate, far and near, Canon Crosthwaite's "Modest Inquiry."

FIRST SORROW.

Suggested by "Golden Hours" in "Loving Thoughts for Lonely Hours." By M. G.

THE days of childhood—were they golden?
We see them through a golden haze
Of memory; but, when near beholden,
Were they indeed such golden days?

No, not of gold those early hours,
Although their passing pleased us well.
They were but lovely vernal flowers,
Fading and withering ere they fell.

But when our earliest grief was blended
With trembling faith, our hearts to melt;
When childhood's careless joys were ended,
And life's reality was felt;—

When first we cried to God alone;—
That was indeed the golden hour!
Then seed of heavenly life was sown
In weakness, to be raised in power.

The richest store of heavenly gain
May spring from deepest earthly loss.
The holiest joy has roots in pain—
Eternal glory in the Cross.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

THE Prize-day at Oakham School was the 26th ult. At the anniversary service the preacher was Canon Sidney Smith, an old Oakhamian. Before the distribution of the prizes, the Head Master gave an account of the year's progress, noting the great increase of numbers, and the additions to the school buildings, which consisted of a music-room, laboratory, and new boarding-house. In the list of honours were included a First and Second Class in the Classical Tripos, Foundation Scholarship at Trinity, Cambridge, etc.

WEDNESDAY, the 27th ult., was Speech and Prize

Day at Forest School, Walthamstow. The proceedings opened with a short service in chapel, at which Archdeacon Johnson delivered the address. After the luncheon in the gymnasium the Bishop of Colchester distributed the prizes in the new hall, the usual concert and speeches following. Among the successes gained by pupils during the year the Head Master noticed a First Class in Chemistry, a Second in Classical Moderations, and an Open Exhibition at Oxford, besides a good number of certificates in the Senior and Junior Examinations of the Oxford and Cambridge Board. The feature of the day was the presentation of his portrait to the Warden, Canon Guy, D.D., for thirty years Head Master, by the present members of the school. The unveiling of the picture, which hangs in the memorial hall just erected at a cost of £3,000, by old boys and friends, took place amidst hearty applause. Mrs. Guy, on her retirement, was also presented with a handsome gold brooch as a memento of her devotion to the welfare of the boys. Mr. N. Powell, in the unavoidable absence of Earl Nelson and Colonel Makins, returned thanks for the vice-presidents.

At Warwick the prizes were distributed by Archdeacon Farrar. In his opening statement the Head Master (the Rev. J. P. Way) was able to speak in warm terms of the prosperity of the school, and the Oxford examiner (the Rev. A. Short) of the work. Archdeacon Farrar afterwards delivered a genial address to the boys, in which he said : "More than fifty years ago there was a Jewish boy who was clerk in a solicitor's offices, and to the intense scorn and amusement of his comrades he used always to say to them he intended to become Prime Minister of England. He not only became Prime Minister, but a very prominent and eminent Prime Minister ; and you all know that his name was Benjamin Disraeli. (Cheers.) It is not so generally known that exactly the same thing was true of the late Sir Robert Peel. He told his friend, Sir J. Scott, that when he was a boy somebody said to him that the boy who made up his mind to be anything could be anything, and then Sir Robert Peel said to himself, 'If that is true I will make up my mind to be Prime Minister of England ;' and you know he too became Prime Minister, and a very great Prime Minister indeed. (Cheers.) One instance more. Over fifty years ago, a rude, rough, half-educated, ungainly boy, who looked as if all his limbs were out of joint, and who altogether made a most unfavourable impression on those who knew him, who failed as a storekeeper, failed as a rail-splitter, driving a canal boat, and a great many other things, and yet who in the lowest depths of misfortune used to say he one day intended to be President of the United States, grew up to be President of the United States ; and he has left a greater name as President than any other, except, perhaps, Washington, of his predecessors. That boy was Abraham Lincoln. (Cheers.) Now the memory of many of you will probably suggest a great many similar examples, and I have no doubt that some of the abler of you have been saying, 'I mean to be Archbishop of Canterbury, I mean to be Field Marshal, I mean to be Prime Minister, and I mean to be Lord Chancellor.' Well, depend upon it, if you make up your mind to be any one of those things, if you are prepared to pay the price for them, if when you grow up you still think they are worth labouring for and still continue to pay the price for them, you may be Field Marshal, or Archbishop of Canterbury, or Prime Minister ; and any of you may fulfil the ideas you have before you, because youth and determination are simply irresistible, and carry everything before them. (Cheers.) And I not only tell you that it may be so, and has been in many thousands of instances, but I will give you the secret of it. The secret is not genius—genius does what it must ; it is not talent—talent does what it can ; but it is simply perseverance, it is sleepless energy, indomitable resolution, and fixed tenacity of will. I think it is somewhere in one of Charles Dickens's books, the writer says, 'It is "dogged" that does it.' It is exactly that which makes ultimate success."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Boodle, Rev. J. A., Curate of West Malling, and Diocesan Inspector of Schools ; Vicar of Boughton-under-Blean, near Faversham.

Bull, Rev. James Henry, Curate of New Harbour, Trinity Bay, Newfoundland.

Daniell, Rev. Egerton Frederic, B.A., Rector of Sully, Glamorgan.

Dearden. Rev. Henry Woodhouse, M.A., Vicar of Southborough, Tunbridge Wells.

Faber, Rev. Arthur Henry, M.A., Rector of Sprotborough ; Canon of Tockerington in York Minster.

Ground, Rev. William David, Vicar of Alnham, Alnwick.

Hall, Rev. E. Grainger, Vicar of St. Silas', Islington ; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Knightsbridge.

Harrison, Rev. E. H., Rector of Ashow, Warwickshire ; Vicar of Kington, Herefordshire.

Hill, Rev. E. B., Curate of Ringwood ; Vicar of Bitterne, Southampton.

Keighley, Rev. C. A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Penge.

Nunn, Rev. Charles Rushbrook, Perpetual Curate of Norley, Cheshire.

Owen, Rev. T., Vicar of Ketley ; Vicar of Christ Church, Wellington.

Rees, Rev. Llewellyn Arnott, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Llandogo, Monmouth.

Sharp, Rev. T., Rector of Harvington, Evesham, Worcestershire.

Stanhope, Hon. Berkeley Lionel, Dean of Hereford ; Master of St. Ethelbert's, Hospital, Hereford.

Sykes, Rev. William, Vicar of Widdrington, Acklington.

Thorp, Rev. Charles F., Perpetual Curate of Beadnell, Northumberland.

White, Rev. William B., Curate of St. Pancras ; Vicar of St. Mark's, Old Street.

Wilkinson, Rev. James Blunt ; Vicar of All Saints', Darlaston.

Wood, Rev. Robert, M.A., Rector of Halsted, Kent ; Rector of Smarden, Kent.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beever, Rev. William Holt, of Pencraig Court, Ross, Rector of Marstow and Pencoyd, and Canon of Llandaff, suddenly, on the 30th ult., aged 62.

Dibdin, Rev. Robert William, M.A., Minister of West Street Chapel, St. Giles's, at 62, Torrington Square, on the 23rd ult., aged 81.

Hanbury, Rev. Herbert Henry, Priest, sometime Curate of St. Paul's, Brighton, youngest son of the Rev. A. Hanbury, Vicar of Burns, Suffolk, on the 30th ult., aged 47.

Satchell, Rev. William Fletcher, late English Chaplain and Missionary in Brazil, at 19, Addington Road, Reading, on the 28th ult., aged 54.

Smith, Rev. Philip S., M.A., of the Oxford University Mission to Calcutta, and son of the late Mr. Joseph Smith, of the Park, Nottingham, at Calcutta, on the 29th ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE BODY AN EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

By the Most Rev. the BISHOP OF MEATH.

Sermon preached before the British Medical Association in St. Patrick's Cathedral, on Tuesday, August 2nd, 1887.

"Waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."—Rom. viii. 23.

"VANITY of vanities, saith the preacher, vanity of vanities; all is vanity. What profit hath man of all his labour wherein he laboureth under the sun? One generation goeth and another generation cometh, and the earth abideth for ever. The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to his place where he ariseth. The wind goeth towards the south, and turneth about into the north: it turneth about continually in its course, and the wind returneth again to its circuits. All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full. Unto the place whither the rivers go, thither they go again. All things are full of weariness; man cannot utter it: the eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor the ear filled with hearing. That which hath been is that which shall be; and that which hath been done is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun." These melancholy words, the despairing utterance of a Jew, who, in the terrible struggles of the Maccabean times, and under the influence of effete Greek philosophy, had lost his old faith without gaining anything to support him instead of it; these melancholy words, the introduction to a most melancholy book, express the feelings which the contemplation of the vastness and sameness of nature and the littleness of man has always produced on minds abandoned to such contemplation. The ancient classics, as all know who have been trained therein, abound in similar lamentations over the aimlessness and fruitlessness of human life; its brief enjoyments, its resultless waste, its gradually but surely deepening disappointments And, though modern science has discovered that the author of "Ecclesiastes" was mistaken in thinking that all things remain always the same, though it is now known that this earth will not abide for ever, that it had a beginning of existence, and will have an end of it, that constant flux rather than enduring sameness is the law of nature, yet it cannot tell what preceded the beginning nor what will follow the ending of phenomenal existence. Progress, upon the whole, there seems to be, from the lower to the higher, but with many and marked exceptions; and this progress is itself so slow, the scale on which it moves is so enormous, that man's personal experience cannot perceive it. To us it is as though it were not, and meanwhile the course of nature goes on for us with remorseless uniformity. For us the thing that hath been is the thing that shall be. The sun rises and sets, the seasons change, men are born and live and love and die; the old story repeats itself with wearisome monotony, amidst all the discoveries and improvements that make life more full and rapid but not more happy. There are the bright hopes, the eager life, the longing for enjoyment, the resolve to do great things of youth and early manhood. Then gradually the powers diminish; doing becomes more difficult, enjoyment less possible; the soaring anticipations subside into disappointment. What with the friction of life, what with the limitations of the intellect, what with lost opportunities, what with the gradual decay of the body, what with the inevitable withdrawal of the objects of affection, the summary of the most successful career must ever be, "vanity of vanities, vanity of vanities, all is vanity."

Now, surely, this feeling is in itself a strong indication of something beyond the present scene. Were what we now experience all, the life of man would be unaccountable; to the highest and most thoughtful it would be intolerable. I say the life of *man*, for the lower animals exhibit no trace of those feelings of disappointment and conscious imperfection which the writer of Ecclesiastes has so gloomily depicted. And this feeling of conscious imperfection, which all the amazing discoveries of science serve only to make more distressing, this feeling which frets against the limitations of intellect and action, though of itself it could not establish the fact of another life hereafter, does most powerfully corroborate the reasons we have from other quarters for expecting it. Pessimism like that of Ecclesiastes is the most powerful argument I know outside direct Revelation for a life beyond the grave. I lay no stress whatever on the metaphysical reasonings which seem to have in some way satisfied the mind of one of our deepest thinkers of the simplicity of the soul's essence and its consequent indiscerptibility and indestructibility. Such speculations are but a poor foundation for any certain hope. The Christian reason for hoping and awaiting with full assurance a personal hereafter is the justice and benevolence of God, who has surely not made man in vain, nor doomed that after a brief tenancy of this globe—brief in comparison with the life of the universe—the whole race shall eventually disappear, and all its powers and struggles and discoveries end in resultless annihilation. Above all, our reasons for expecting a personal immortality is the great fact that Christ has risen from the dead, and has thus brought to light the life and immortality which, if we forecast in vain, we are as much below the brutes in truth and symmetry of being as we are above them in the power and nature of our intelligence. Nor is it a trifling corroboration of the Resurrection of our Saviour that it bears out the hopes which are formed in us by considerations such as those I have been adverting to : still more that it bears out these hopes in a manner for which Christ's contemporaries were utterly unprepared, and which, therefore, their own invention, if that had been at work, would never have devised. The Resurrection of the body to which St. Paul looks as the completion of our adoption was the very last thing to which longers for immortality in the ancient world would have resorted. Those thinkers in classic days who ventured to entertain a dim and distant hope of a future existence always spoke of it as connected with the discarding of the trammels of the body, which they regarded as an incubus pressing on the free development and action of the mind or spirit. Hence when Paul preached Jesus and His resurrection as a basis of our future hopes, he was ridiculed by the very men who would have listened respectfully to a dissertation on our innate and necessary immortality, and on the blessedness of a soul freed for ever from the burden of the flesh. But Paul had no such doctrine as was then fashionable to preach to the assembled philosophers and idlers who sought a gentle excitement in listening to what this babbler might say. He preached Jesus and His resurrection as the ground and type of ours, the first term of a new series of existence, and the assembly laughed and jeered and dismissed him with polite contempt. Like modern sceptics, they probably thought no supernatural fact could be accepted on mere historic evidence, especially as that fact went in the teeth of all their prepossessions. They were satisfied with their own philosophic schemes, just as philosophers are now, though no two of their schemes agreed together; and so without any further examination they went away, dispensed from inquiry by the intrinsic absurdity of the new doctrine. And the Schools of Athens in a few years all came to nought, conquered by the crucified Galilæan and his mad apostle, as Festus thought him.

Yet it is curious to remark how this triumph of Christianity over philosophy was for a long time qualified, and even turned into apparent defeat, by the advocates of Christianity themselves. Metaphysics corrupted Christianity, and though the great cardinal fact of our religion—the Resurrection of Christ—was not formally denied, its significance was lost. In the last century the argument for an hereafter ignored the Resurrection altogether. Nay, it was incompatible with it. For if it be desirable for the soul to be delivered from all connection with the body, if death is to be welcomed because it will effect this deliverance, if the soul, thus delivered, will have a separate and more dignified existence, then the Resurrection, whether of Christ or of ourselves after the type of Christ's, is a mistake. If we are better off without a body than with one, why should we, in the language of St. Paul, await the redemption of the body as the completion of our adoption into the family of God? Why should we desire, as the same apostle elsewhere says we do, not to be unclothed, stripped of this present miserable earthly frame, but rather to be clothed, invested, while still in this body, with that celestial mansion not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, which St. Paul regards as having the power of absorbing and transmuting our present earthly frame? Why should the Church, in the most solemn and pathetic of all her offices, pray that it may please God shortly to accomplish the number of his elect, and to hasten His kingdom that so we may have our perfect consummation and bliss in His eternal and everlasting glory? A prayer which implies that our perfect consummation is not reached, our perfect bliss is not attained, at the moment when we die; that it awaits that final advent of the Judge of all, when, the further increase of the human race being arrested, all that compose its now completed sum shall appear in a new bodily form before the Throne. I boldly say that Christianity, as understood and proclaimed by Paul, is a mistake if the metaphysical theology of the last century be true. If the soul can act better—can indeed only then act freely—when it is delivered from bodily trammels, then the resurrection of the body is an impertinence, and Christianity is the degradation, not the exaltation of our hopes. And in this light, no doubt, it presented itself to many of the idling philosophasters on Mars' Hill.

Are, then, Christianity and philosophic thought irreconcilable? Must we give up one for the other, and make our choice which we will retain? Here, I conceive, comes in a case of Virgil's adage—"The first path of deliverance, a thing you least expect, shall be opened for you by your apparent enemies." Physiology, or the accurate examination of animated nature, has stepped in to correct by its careful observations, the fancy flights of metaphysics. Without pretending to define the nature of the soul, or mind, or intellectual principle, whatever we may call it, recognising only that there is a something which secures identity under the constant flux of changing sensation and emotion, the wisest physiologists have endeavoured to trace the means through which this principle of sameness operates. They have ascertained that for every mental effort, for every emotion, there is a definite corresponding change in a certain substance in the brain. No thought of the mind but leaves its trace upon the body, and thus, when the brain becomes diseased, the action of the mind becomes distorted, sometimes unduly accelerated, sometimes altogether checked. Mental disease is, therefore, only a phrase retained for convenience to denote such bodily disease as renders the mind incapable of due action. Now, it seems quite obvious, and yet I know not whether it has ever been pointed out, that this discovery is altogether in favour of the Christian doctrine of the future life. That doctrine represents our final consummation and bliss as conditional on our being reunited with a body of infinitely higher capacities than the body with which we are now endowed. Directly in the teeth of those metaphysical speculations which fed the half-hearted desponding hopes of the best among the ancients, and which were revived by Christian apologists in the last century, Christianity tells us that it is to the perfecting and the exalting of our bodily frame that we must look for our ultimate happiness, anticipating by the actual fact of Christ's resurrection and the doctrine based upon it the tendency of modern physiological researches. Christianity thus restored to what it was in Apostolic preaching, what it is in the creeds of the Universal or Catholic Church, finds an ally where it is generally thought to have found a foe, and in the recent discoveries of physiology obtains corroborative evidence of its truth, evidence the most powerful because absolutely non-collusive. For, assuredly, physiologists have not been led to their investigations by any wish or expectation that their result would be favourable to Christianity, in which many of them did not believe, to which some of them have been bitterly hostile. Yet their investigations, conducted from whatever motive save love of the Gospel, really accord with the doctrine of the Gospel, as preached by Paul and ridiculed by the Athenian loungers; accord with it far better than do the systems of those metaphysicians who, whether defending or assailing Christianity have equally mistaken its nature and perverted its message. And surely the fact that the Gospel two thousand years ago proclaimed a hope far more in unison with recent discoveries than with the conceptions of the times which gave it birth, surely this fact is one of the most startling contributory evidences of its divinity.

On the present occasion I have not time to follow out the line of thought I have ventured to indicate. That I must leave to your own reflections. But I will endeavour very briefly to point out the bearing of the Christian doctrine, asserting, as it does, the necessity of a body for the perfection of our existence, on the subject of the care due to our present bodily frame—this body of our humiliation, as St. Paul denominates it, and as we assuredly experience it to be, alike in its weakness, its wants and its evanescence. And here one of the more noticeable particulars is the circumstance that in marked opposition to all Oriental theosophies, our Saviour Himself invariably treated the human frame with the tenderest care and the most absolute respect. Almost all the mighty works by which He accredited himself as a messenger of God, a representative of the Divine, were miracles either of healing the diseases or supplying the wants, or even in one case ministering to the enjoyments, of the body. Completely alien to the gnosticism which soon began to leaven the Church, and has corrupted it more or less ever since—a system which saw in matter generally an antagonist to the Creator and to mind, and, therefore, treated the body as an enemy to be overcome and destroyed—Christ came eating and drinking. His most exquisite parables were uttered at rich men's tables, and the only slander the Jews ever tried to fasten on Him was based on that total absence of ascetic severity which distinguished His life from that of His forerunner. Even his dress would seem to have been choice, His outer robe having been woven without seam throughout, thereby indicating a certain care for the body it invested, a consciousness of personal dignity. And yet it was the *body of His humiliation* that he treated with such respect. If Christ, then, did not disdain attending to His own person, and lavished care and attention on the persons of so many others, if almost all His mighty acts were acts effecting the relief of bodily ailments or the removal of bodily defects, if the few miracles recorded as having been subsequently wrought by His apostles were of the same character —except two miracles of punishment—are we not justified on Christian principles in claiming for the ministry of the body a high degree, not only of beneficence and usefulness, but even of sanctity? I know, indeed, no class of men since the time of Christ who more completely tread in the path of Christ, so far as external action goes, however little they may intend so doing, than that class, that profession who devote themselves to the cure or relief of bodily disease or suffering. The Good Physician would seem to have a peculiar and intimate relation, if they would but recognise it, with those who are endeavouring by natural means, often with great labour and fatigue, to do that which He at once effected by supernatural power, and with perfect certainty, though not without a conscious efflux of virtue, which would appear to have in some degree exhausted His sacred person. When, therefore, they are overcome by the toil incidental to their profession, or fall themselves victims to disease contracted in attending to the sick, let them recollect how St. Matthew applies to Christ in His function of miraculous healer the words of Isaiah, "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses"; words which certainly seem in this application to imply that each such act of healing was not an effortless act of sheer omnipotence, but involved fatigue, and even exhaustion, as well as sympathy. That medical men too seldom realise the ennobling likeness between their own duties and the activity of Christ is their own great loss, inasmuch as they are thus deprived of a secret support, the benefit of which the more believing hearts among them will thankfully acknowledge. No doubt the beneficence of Christ proceeded from higher motives than those which usually prompt the actions of simple men, and had a higher object. His chief aim was to reach the hearts and souls of men through attending to their bodies, as well as to substantiate His mission. Yet He never seems to have declined working a miracle wherever there was sufficient trust to convert what would otherwise have been a mere act of overpowering omnipotence into an act of mutual human sympathy. And wherever good is done, though the motive be not the highest, Christ is virtually preached, and God is virtually honoured; honoured not with the homage of the lip, but with the devotion of the life; and the man who acknowledges no higher motive than the wish to advance science or to benefit mankind in this life, subordinating both these motives very probably to the aim of gathering wealth or competence, does nevertheless imitate unconsciously and distantly the great benefactor of our race. But while fully recognising the Christ-like character of the medical profession in itself, I venture to suggest to its members a more direct and personal imitation of that noblest of all characters, a more purposed modelling of themselves on His example. And this may be done even by those who do not believe in His Divine commission. It was an unbeliever who said that probably no better method could be devised by any one of ruling his life aright than to ask himself before each doubtful or decisive action, Would Christ, in the same circumstances, have done this? The character of Christ cannot be studied without imbibing something of His nature. And what a nature! Who was ever so delicate in His intercourse with others as was Christ? His deeds of kindness left no sting of inferiority in their recipients. He never condescended. Who was ever so full of sympathy as Christ? The material benefit was only half of what was conferred. Who was ever so void of self-assertiveness as Christ? While never yielding one atom of His dignity, He never forced it on men's notice; He made no clamorous assertion of it. His voice was not raised in the streets. Any kind of trickery, even the trickery of mannerism, one feels at once to be inconceivably impossible in Him. Who ever cared less for wealth and position than did Christ? He spoke with equal authority to the lowest and the highest. He spared not the stern rebuke which the highest, perhaps, require oftener than the lowest. Cruelty, again—the unnecessary infliction of pain—one instinctively feels would have been unutterably abhorrent to our Saviour. And though we have no record of any word of His on the subject, I defy any one who sets Christ before him to carry out, from whatever motive, the devilish iple of Spinoza that we are out of relation to the inferior animals, and have, therefore, no duties to them, and may treat them as we please.* The pursuit of science at the expense of humanity is surely inconsistent with the mind of Christ. What absolute purity, too, in the whole life and style of Christ! No ambiguous word ever escaped His lips: no breath of slander ever attainted Him. All these, the last not least, are points on which the medical profession needs special warning, because it is necessarily brought into close contact with some of the most debasing sides and moods of human nature, and is tempted to treat them with levity or coarseness; because the very process of learning what must be known for usefulness is fraught with terrible danger to delicacy and purity. The very conception of humanity may be lowered by the attention being long fastened almost exclusively on its lowest functions. Unlike other mechanisms, the human body can never be studied in all its perfection, for it begins to change and decompose the instant such study becomes possible. What in health was full of grace and dignity becomes loathsome and horrible in death, and disgust in many cases leads to brutal irreverence. For all such temptations no better safeguard can be imagined than to steep the mind in the character and precepts of the Great Physician—the Physician who will reconstruct our frames on a nobler and more enduring type when He returns again in His majesty to judge the quick and the dead, and to renovate the universe. During the Middle Ages, when matter and mind were supposed to be destructively arrayed against each other, the study of anatomy was proscribed, and that of physiology became impossible. It is satisfactory to see that this attitude of the mediæval Church is now officially abandoned. But Christianity itself had long before consecrated medical studies by erecting the first hospital ever dedicated to the cure of the sick poor at Rome. This hospital, founded in the time, perhaps partly under the influence, of St. Jerome, absorbed the wealth and leisure of two Roman ladies, and the religious benevolence of which it was the active expression perpetuates itself even still in the denomination House or Palace of God, which is borne by the chief hospital of Paris. But while we devote to the cure of bodily disease energies which, especially in the domain of surgery, seem to have an almost illimitable future, it is well that we should at each moment recall to our minds the great truth that this world, and all it contains and promises, are essentially transitory and evanescent, and that our highest aspirations can only be realised in that hidden future state in which the adoption shall be completed by the redemption of the body from all its present imperfections, and its transformation into the perfect organ of a perfected spirit. Nothing short of this can save us from the otherwise overwhelming consciousness of ultimate inevitable defeat, for the body must eventually decay, and the utmost skill can but procrastinate its catastrophe. But whilst things seen are temporal, the things that are not seen are eternal, and in the sure and certain hope of them we may defy disappointment, and triumph in defeat.

---

* Spinosa Ethica, pars iv. propositio 73, cap. 26. Quicquid in rerum naturâ extra homines datur, id nostræ utilitatis ratio conservare non postulat, sed pro ejus vario usu conservare, destruere, vel quocunque modo ad nostrum usum adaptare nos docet.

◆

JESUS CHRIST CRUCIFIED.

By the Rev. HENRY L. PAGET, M.A., the new Vicar of St. Pancras, London.

Introductory Sermon Preached on Sunday, July 24th, 1887.

"For I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." — 1 Corinthians, ii. 2.

St. Paul has a clear and vivid memory of his arrival at Corinth some three years ago. He had come from Athens, where his work had been marked by very little that could be called success. He was apparently dispirited, partly from bodily sickness, partly, perhaps, from the disappointment he had undergone. And he finds himself face to face with the difficulties and problems of a new sphere of work, in one of the most important and active cities of the ancient world.

Corinth was famous or infamous for its luxury, for its immorality, for its reckless and restless freedom of thought. It was crowded with merchants and sailors—and yet it combined the temptations of a luxurious metropolis with those of a seaport town. It was a strange and uncongenial spot for one whose training had been that of a Jew, and whose heart still clung to the memories and traditions of his fathers. It was an ever various and shifting scene that lay before his eyes—people of every race and station moving so rapidly to and fro; conversation flying so rapidly on every topic and in every tongue. Ah! it wanted no ordinary faith to believe that what he brought was indeed the thing that without distinction all these people needed—to believe that one and the selfsame message was the message for them all—that in one great direction all their thoughts were to be turned, to one great object all eyes, all hearts were to be led.

It needed faith for him to close his mind to all else, to silence in his heart all other voices, to determine to know nothing amongst them save Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

Two methods of approach at least there were which St. Paul deliberately and of set purpose rejected. There might have been for some a real temptation to postpone, at least for a while, the actual subject of Christian preaching; to lead up to it, as it were, through a variety of topics which might have seemed more natural, more familiar, and more congenial to those amongst whom the work had to be done. It would have been easy for St. Paul to interest himself for the while in those things which the Corinthians cared most about, and which formed the main occupations of their life, to lead them through these onwards and upwards to higher thoughts. Even had St. Paul made up his mind that Christ crucified was to be the object to which he hoped in the end to lead these people, he might have thought it well only gradually to close the door against other thoughts and other subjects of instruction.

Or, again, it might have seemed the wisest course to study very carefully the way in which the truth was to be put; to adorn his preaching with a variety of ornaments which might attract people who were possibly indifferent or hostile to the main drift of his message; and so to make even those who did not care for what he had got to say, care for his way of saying it. It required, brethren, no ordinary faith, no ordinary firmness, to go straight to these Corinthians with the message of Jesus Christ and Him crucified. But St. Paul knew that in this very simplicity, this open and unflinching directness, the power of his appeal, the strength of his preaching were contained. He knew that close at hand was a danger, so great, so fatal, that the very thought of it filled his heart with horror and dismay.

There was such a thing as making the cross of Christ of none effect, of robbing God's message of its power, feeding God's people with stones instead of bread. The safeguard, the only safeguard lay in a clearness and directness about which there could be no mistake. He dare not crowd the canvas with details and ornaments lest men should miss the one great central Figure of the picture. He dare not multiply the subjects of his instruction lest men should lose sight of that which is alone God's great and irresistible appeal to their souls. What shall I preach about in Corinth? What shall I tell these crowds who throng the harbours and crowd the market places? What will touch alike the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, the weak and the strong? What, indeed, save that by which his own life had become a new thing; that in which the power and wisdom of God stood revealed? "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

"Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." The atonement wrought out by our Saviour upon the cross; our reconciliation to God through the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, it is clear what place these occupied in the preaching of the Apostles. They were not introduced as an afterthought, coming in at the end of the sermon and throwing a certain light on some one or two aspects of the subject under consideration. The atonement was not one of a variety of subjects which together made up a system called the Gospel. Consc fully conscious, of the sort of difficulty which such preaching would present to some minds, fully conscious of the dislike to it that would arise in others, St. Paul was content, notwithstanding, simply to preach Christ crucified, to suspend before men's eyes the one single image of our Lord upon the cross, to drive in upon their hearts, by steady, urgent persistence, the truth that the Son of God had come down from heaven to bear their sins, to save them by the sacrifice of His own life. I wonder whether we all realise as we ought how exclusively, how to the abandonment of almost all other teaching, the Apostles insisted upon this. It is perfectly unfair to say or think that, after all, the space occupied in the Epistles by this direct Gospel teaching is small compared with that occupied by the discussion of certain other questions and difficulties. Difficulties, of course, would arise in the relations between individual Christians and the relations between church and church. Cases would occur about which St. Paul might be expected to give an answer and decide; and it is interesting from time to time to compare these difficulties with the difficulties of our own day, and to gather from an Apostle's directions what is probably the will of God concerning us; but if we want to discover the real substance of the teaching of the Apostles, of the Gospel as it was revealed to them by the power of the Holy Ghost, we shall look for it in their own direct declarations in such passages as the one which I have taken for my text, "we preach Christ crucified" — "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

Allow me to set side by side with the truth just two conceptions which seem to be common nowadays, which dim men's eyes to the unique and single glory of the cross of Christ, which dull their apprehension of the love of God, which keep them at best in a state of doubtful and half-hearted devotion to our blessed Lord.

Let me speak of the first way of thinking in the language of one of the greatest of Evangelical divines—William Wilberforce, a man as remarkable for his clear and simple personal piety, as for his heroic and persistent efforts on behalf of the national slaves. "Is there not," he says, "cause to fear that with little more than an indistinct and nominal reference to Him Who bore our sins in His own body on the tree, they really rest their eternal hopes on a vague general persuasion of the unqualified mercy of the Supreme Being?" Surely, surely this is so! Surely there are crowds of people who called themselves Christians, who would not willingly disclaim a share in the meritorious death of Christ, who yet give that atoning death a very secondary and unimportant, at least a quite unworthy place alike in their thoughts of God and in their hopes of heaven.

That vague general persuasion of the unqualified [illegible] of the Supreme Being, how poor and thin and unreasonable it is: it is a sort of twilight in which honest, earnest souls cannot bear to linger long. It cannot be true. Surely the very Source and Fountain of holiness must look at sin with something keener and truer than a vague pity, or a sort of sympathetic indifference. Surely it is wretched to rest in a hope that God may be a God of easy indulgence, rather than to push on to the faith that God is the very fire of holy love.

But men will persist in resting in it. And while they do so, no wonder that their thoughts of Christ crucified are dim and vague; no wonder that they misunderstand the cross when they really acknowledge in God no holiness that sin has outraged, no justice that sin has insulted, no love yearning and longing for the souls of men.

And so they look back upon their own lives, and because they see in them no gross outrage against common decency and order, because they pass amongst their fellows for averagely respectable men and women, they hope and trust that this will be enough; in their dimness about God they do not see why He should not be satisfied with people who are satisfied with themselves.

But, brethren, whatever this may be, it is not the religion of Jesus Christ. It is not the religion of a life based on gratitude and nourished and sustained by love. Jesus Christ crucified has very little to do with the thoughts and motives of a life like that.

There are others who look at the matter in a different way. To their mind the benefit of Christ's death lies in the fact that He has somehow diminished the demand of God's holiness and God's law. Their Christian privilege has been for them their admission into a certain number of whom, for Christ's sake, God will ask less than he asks of other people. Christianity has moderated what God asks; and we may rest at ease, quite satisfied that if, on the whole, our life is tolerably good, we shall escape with little or no punishment, and through Christ our Lord shall be at the last partakers of the joys of heaven. Surely we have only to examine this, to find that neither is this the religion of Jesus Christ. It was not to produce this frame of mind amongst his Corinthian disciples that St. Paul determined to know nothing amongst them save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Such a faith as this puts the cross of our Lord into the background, not into the foreground of our thoughts. It is an apology that comes in at the end, not the spring and motive of the whole life. It is a faint and dim and heartless business at the best. It is the same as thinking that Christ came to complete the righteousness of those who were pretty good, instead of thinking that He came to be the Wisdom, and Righteousness, and Salvation of those who were lost. The essence of salvation is not admission to privileges however high; it is not the being reckoned with a number however goodly. We shall be saved not because Christ has lessened and moderated God's demand upon us, because somehow Christianity has lowered God's standard to a point to which we are enabled to attain; but because Christ has died for us, and has taken away our sins, and because the love of Christ, the love of a Saviour Who loved us first and gave Himself for us, has been shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given us.

The more steadily and patiently we read our Bibles, the more earnestly we use the prayers of our Church, the more clear we shall be about the place which the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ should occupy in Christian thought and teaching; the place it should fill in Christian life.

Our Bible does not speak of us as naturally good, it speaks of us as fallen and corrupt. It does not tell us that we can pretty nearly do what is required of us, and that God will somehow supply the rest. It does not tell us that we are naturally lovable. It tells us that the carnal mind is enmity against God. It does not say that the world was slowly but surely finding its way to God, when God looked down in pity and sent His Son to save. It does not speak of our state as hopeful and promising. It speaks of an original taint attaching to our nature, spreading with fearful rapidity over the whole of life, darkening the understanding, lowering and defiling the affections, hardening the heart, and enslaving the will.

And is not this true? Which is the truth, a picture like this or one like that which people are ready to draw for us with light and easy hand of a world that is bright and innocent and glad, into which, if sin enter at all, it enters only as an occasional frailty, darkening the sky only for a moment with a passing cloud—a world that will easily and without effort be won to God.

Ask your own hearts, brethren; ask history; ask those who look most widely and most deeply into the sin and sorrow of human life, and you will feel a new wonder and thrill of thankfulness for the love with which God so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son; you will realise that the only thing that can meet our necessities is the fact that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.

I then, too, by God's grace will know nothing among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified; for, for all of us alike, He is the Power of God and the Wisdom of God. I will, God helping me, bring you simply face to face with the cross of Christ. He from His cross will speak to you, will plead with you better than I can speak or plead.

Before that cross all hearts are open, all desires are known, no secrets can be hid. Men drop the cloaks and the disguises that they wear in common life; they feel and know themselves to be very sinful, very weak, very unworthy of the least of all God's mercies; they recognise the guilt, they know the power of sin.

And still from that cross Jesus Christ stretches out His arms, and bids them draw nigh. He is lifted up and draws all men to Him. Ah! it is a sight most wonderful, the angels do not penetrate the secret of its infinite love. It will fill eternity with the fulness of its mystery. Lovingly, thoughtful, prayerfully, we must meditate upon it if it is to unfold to us its full story of God's infinite pity and love. Yet there is that about it which the simplest can see at a glance, a truth that can be put almost in a word. Come unto Him, all ye that are weary and heavy laden. All ye who feel and know the burden of your sins read there God's power to save, read there the handwriting of God's love.

And that same cross, which tells us of the pardon of the past, which tells us that the Son of God has taken our nature upon Him, and laid down His life for our sakes, must be the very source of that life, which, pardoned and cleansed, we shall live in the sight of God. For that sight must ever remind us of a debt which we shall never be able to repay, an obligation which eternity will not discharge.

Brethren, what is the real secret of a devoted life? What is that which alone can really make men strong and free and unsparing of themselves in the service of God? What is that which alone can lift us above the turmoils of jealousy and the strife of tongues: it is indeed the love of Jesus Christ, the sense of deep indebtedness to Him? We understand one another as side by side before His cross we own, one and all, that we owe Him that which we can never hope to repay.

Repeat it to yourself again and again. Recount to yourself the step after step of His condescension: the glory He left, the shame and poverty He bore, the weariness and toil of His life, here upon earth. Draw near with faith, strong, vivid, realising—such faith as God does supply to those who ask it. Draw near open-eared and open-hearted, attentive and receptive, to the cross of Christ. Drop the shield of apology. Strip off the silly armour of self-defence. You cannot go with these. Stretch out your arms and bare your breast to the stroke of God's conviction, to the darts and arrows of God's love.

Let the rebukes of those who rebuked Him fall on you, until you feel what they must have been to Him, the kiss of Judas, the servant's buffet, the scourges with which the ploughers ploughed upon His back and made long furrows, the piercing of His hands and feet, the dislocation of His whole body upon the cross, the darkening of the sky above, and the spiritual darkness, a darkness that might be felt, overwhelming the whole being of the Son of God.

Let the difficulties of it alone, leave to another time and place the logic and the philosophy of the cross, and see only in the cross of Christ the message of God's love to you; see what the Son of God was content to bear for your sake.

And as there rises in your heart a feeling, I trust no stranger there, yet if a stranger, ah! how much better late than never — a feeling of a debt you can never repay, a love you can never worthily requite, a duty you can never hope to fulfil — you will know, my brethren, what is the real spring of the Christian life, where it begins, what course by God's mercy it takes. "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live: yet not I, but Christ liveth in me. And the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God Who loved me, and gave Himself for me." You will understand why the Christian preacher is content, is determined to know nothing amongst his people save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. You will be able even here to join by anticipation in the heavenly song of praise, "Worthy is the Lamb That was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and honour and glory and blessing. Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto Him That sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

I pray most earnestly, brethren, that this, this love of Jesus, this unfeigned and heartfelt thankfulness to Him for what He has done, may abide and continue with us as the secret of our union, and the all-inspiring motive of our work. No difference of opinion will really part us, no disappointment or failure will really cast us down, no sense of change, no love and regret for those who are gone away will perplex and distress you so long as in steady, hearty devotion you bring to the feet of our Lord Jesus Christ the fruits of your labour and the results of your work. We shall never cease to care for one another if only we are true and patient and persevering in our love and duty to Him.

Think, if you will, of me, and be sure that I will think of and remember you; but let us think of Him above all. Let not His work in this parish be allowed to flag. Still gather the little ones round His sacred feet, still day by day lead home to Him His strayed and wandering sheep. Still try to give Him His heart's desire, and to win, as you have loved to win in time past, the approving sunlight of His smile.

I can well understand how you may be feeling now. I have felt it myself when I have seen a strange face instead of a face I had learnt to trust, and heard a strange voice speaking to me instead of a voice I had come to love and obey. But always we are drawn nearer to one other as we are drawn nearer to Him; and the secret of mutual love and trust is found in a great common love and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. May He of His mercy grant us this, and even the blessings of the past will seem small in comparison of the blessings of the future—for the blessing is not mine nor yours, but His, bestowed by Him on all who earnestly seek His face.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
From Mr. CHARLES WHEELER, Barford, Warwick.
"I have felt so greatly benefited by wearing your **ELECTROPATHIC BELT,** that it affords me pleasure to be able to testify to its **curative power.** The swelling and pain in my legs have quite left me, and I experience a comfortable and warming sensation throughout my body."
GOUT & SCIATICA CURED
Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of the **Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,** should at once stop physicing, and remit 21s. for HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials POST FREE. **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 13, 1887.

FEDERAL UNION.

A GREAT deal has been said, and written at one time or another, on the subject of "Home Reunion"; but one of the latest developments in this direction is what is known as the "National Church Association," which was founded a few months ago, after an address by the Rev. Canon Bradby, the late Head Master of Haileybury College. As far as we can gather from the resolution, which was moved by the Canon, the main principle and objects are: The conferring of self-government of their own communion on the *bonâ fide* members of the present "Church of England," in place of statutory definition and control; 2. The co-ordination with it of other Christian denominations as confederate members of a "National Church of England"; 3. A re-entry of the tolerated bodies on their sequestrated participation in the older portion of the Church endowment, and the preservation of the whole for spiritual purposes. In order to carry out these proposals, there is the draft of a proposed Bill to be submitted to the Legislature, which shall enable the association to carry out its designs. Among the proposals are, of course, the repeal of all Acts of Uniformity; secondly, "that ecclesiastical property, now limited to the Episcopal Church and its subsidiary corporations, to become applicable to religious use by other organised bodies" of English Christians, under the following rule:—To vest in the episcopalian body all parish and district churches, residences, and glebe lands; all archiepiscopal, episcopal and decanal residences; all property acquired by private gift or bequest since the Act of Uniformity. All other ecclesiastical property (subject to existing life-interest) to vest in national or federal Church of England, and to be applicable for maintenance of divine worship and other Christian use by all the several confederated religious bodies. In order to further carry out this plan a Church Temporalities Commission is to be appointed, who are to have power to schedule the property according to the proposed plan, the Registrar General's report as to population in the last census to be authority for numbers in each confederated body, and each commissioner to have £2,000 a year.

The Episcopal Church is to have a General Synod, members to be elected by stating that he or she is a *boná fide* member of the Episcopal Church, and adherent to its worship; there is also to be a representative assembly of the national Church, which is to be called into existence, the members of which are to be "elected by each federal body according to magnitude." Seats in the House of Lords for archbishops and bishops are to be abolished. With regard to cathedrals, we read, "Cathedral appointments to be made by assembly: dean, and enough canons for daily service, to be episcopal; three members of chapter to be from other bodies. Customary episcopal daily service according to Prayer Book to be continued. Occasional celebration of divine worship by other bodies to take place. Once a year at least a united service and communion of all to be held."

We have given the main points of the proposed union, but we wonder whether any one, except the gentleman who proposed the resolution, and those who agreed with it, ever think that it will be accepted by the great body of Churchmen. To desire unity is one thing, and to see Christendom reunited would be a grand and glorious sight, but it must not be by losing sight of the great fundamental doctrines of Christianity, nor yet the taking up of any false position, and losing sight of those errors which divided and still do divide the Eastern from the Western Church. So again, we do not see how any one can really support the proposal for the "re-entry of the tolerated bodies on their sequestrated participation in the older Church endowment," neither do we quite see the force of the suggestion in the proposed Bill that *all other* ecclesiastical property except the parish and district churches, glebe lands, residences and episcopal residences are to be vested in the National or Federal Church of England—whatever that may mean. There is no mention of tithes, so whether these are to be alienated we are unable to say: the other ecclesiastical property, such as hospitals, schools, &c., are to be alienated. Surely it were better to be disestablished right out, than to have anything in the shape of such piecemeal disestablishment.

In dealing with this question we must ever bear this in mind, that Dissenters went out from us at a time when spiritual lethargy reigned supreme; but the door is not closed against them, they can return if they like, but that is no reason why they should be allowed to participate in the older endowments of the Church! The endowments were left long before there were any such bodies known as Wesleyans, Free Methodists or Congregationalists, and Particular Baptists. The proposal savours very much of what we read in the Radical programme, viz., "That the State is perfectly within its rights, if the Legislature shall think fit, in diverting every shilling of Church property to secular uses." Such a statement we can understand, because it comes from those who do not deny that it is their wish to see the Church disestablished and disendowed.

The proposal for a Church of England Synod might meet with acceptance, if the terms of membership had not been so loose, but we think it very doubtful indeed whether Churchmen will accept anything so vague and indefinite. So again the proposal as to cathedrals is hardly likely to find much favour. We do not imagine that the proposal that three members of the chapter shall be from bodies other than the Church, or that a united service and communion of all is to be held, can ever be carried out. Who is to conduct it? The Archbishop of Canterbury or General Booth? the one in Episcopal robes, the other in the crimson jersey which is worn by members of the Army. So also the Representative Assembly of the National Church is a very vague and unsatisfactory term. The conditions of recognition are to be—1. Sufficient historical duration; 2. A certain magnitude of effect on the national life; 3. Adequate education and security for character of members. The first and second of these conditions will be very difficult to settle.

For any practical results that are likely to accrue from these proposals, we are afraid that they are very little. No such Act of Parliament as is suggested by the National Church Association is likely to be accepted. The reforms are too sweeping, the terms too vague and indefinite. If reunion is necessary, it will come in due course; we cannot hurry it. There are many things that Churchmen hold more dear, which would have to be abrogated if all of the tolerated bodies are to be brought into one fold. The best plan is to try and see how far we can agree in matters non-essential to have more charity one toward another. But representative assemblies of National Church, Dissenting ministers as members of cathedral bodies, united service and communion of all religious bodies in our cathedrals, will never be accepted by the great body of Churchmen. There are plenty of ways open for members of the National Church Association to work for reunion without urging such things as are contained in the proposed Bill.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ST. PAUL THE AUTHOR OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

SIR,—I venture to complain of unfair treatment received at the hands of the *Guardian*. After a prolonged silence of nearly three years the *Guardian* has placed before its readers a very one-sided review of the first volume of my work. This one-sidedness is perhaps nothing unusual; but the Editor has suppressed a short letter of mine, pointing out that some of my chief arguments had been altogether ignored. The unfairness consists in expressing strong opinions against my conclusions, without so much as mentioning some of the most important arguments in favour of them, and without admitting one single word of explanation. This certainly seems contrary to English ideas of justice, when, all the time, I am only asking for a fair trial, and for an unprejudiced examination of the numerous facts, which have been collected with much labour and perseverance. I naturally object both to a conspiracy of silence, and to a preconceived and prejudiced decision. Still less can one reconcile oneself to the process of being "burked."

The reviewer makes more than one statement which can only receive a point-blank contradiction. Thus, he says, "That St. Paul had St. Luke with him as companion is true and certain," that is, as constant and intimate companion (see below).

No, I venture to say that this is certainly uncertain, and probably untrue. Luke is never mentioned by St. Paul in any Epistle before his arrival at Rome, in A.D. 61—that is, Luke is never mentioned by name in all the long lists of the Apostle's fellow-labourers, for *fifteen years* at least after St. Paul's conversion. Strange treatment of such a bosom friend! This erroneous idea of intimate companionship may have arisen from St. Paul's own words in 2 Tim., "The time of my departure is at hand . . . . . *only* Luke is with me."

It was Timothy, not Luke, who was specially chosen by St. Paul to be his companion and helper. This was about A.D. 51, and for years Timothy was most intimately associated with St. Paul, and visited, in his company, almost all the places named in the Acts.

2. "The cast of thought and character of mind and feeling which animates the Epistles are quite peculiar, and quite unlike those of the third Evangelist."

What then does Alford mean by stating that, "doubtless we may trace a similar cast of mind and feeling in some instances," and that "in Luke those parables and sayings are principally found which most directly regard the great doctrine of man's free justification by grace through faith." Was not this St. Paul's own *peculiar* doctrine referred to when he spoke of "*my* Gospel"? (Gal. ii. 2.) And don't the third Gospel and the Acts, like the Epistles, deal with the relation of the Gentiles to Judaism, and to the nascent Christianity of the Apostolic age?

3. "The constant witness borne by the Church about the matter" (of Luke's authorship).

This constant witness begins with Irenæus (A.D. 170), a whole century after the date of the Acts, and it is re-echoed without question or misgiving by succeeding writers, who, though "giants in divinity," were, as Dean Burgon says, "children in criticism.' "It is instructive to notice," says Canon Westcott, "how the tradition (about Luke) grows more definite in time."

4. "Paul's marked individuality would very powerfully influence those with whom he was associated."

Yes, great indeed must have been Paul's influence over his intimate associate and son in the faith, Timothy! But why should he have had this wonderful influence over Luke, "the beloved physician," whom quite possibly the Apostle, towards the close of his career, met personally in Rome for the *first* time. At all events, on the usual hypothesis of the "we-passages," as Archdeacon Farrar observes, "St. Luke seems to have stayed at Philippi *seven years*"—that is, Luke was absent from Paul during *seven* of the most active and important years of the Apostle's career.

5. "The coincidences of vocabulary (and plenty of them) can be sufficiently accounted for by this intimacy."

No; not even if the intimacy of Luke with Paul could be demonstrated, instead of being, as it is, pure conjecture. How could this intimacy account for Luke having no special thoughts, feelings, wishes, opinions, views, words, phrases, peculiarities or personality of his own. How could this intimacy account for his always making use of the thoughts, feelings, views, words, figures of speech and peculiarities of St. Paul, unless, as I say, St. Paul himself was at his elbow superintending and revising? Who could have a thorough knowledge of the interior of St. Paul's heart and mind but St. Paul himself. No two human minds ever were or ever can be alike. Certainly the minds of the *Gentile* physician, Luke, and of the devout *Jewish* apostle of Christ, St. Paul, could not possibly have been alike, for St. Paul was *unique*.

The *Guardian* reviewer judiciously ignores the following arguments (which are quite unanswerable), namely, that:

(*a*.) The Acts are the work of a *Jew*. They are coloured by Jewish modes of thought, and saturated with Hebraistic idioms from the LXX. Luke to the end remained an uncircumcised *Gentile* (Col. iv. 11, 14). It is quite impossible that Luke could have written the Acts if he had wished to write them. And why should he, more than Timothy, wish to do so?

(*b*.) The Acts cannot be *memorials* of *Paul the Martyr*, as they do not even mention his death, but leave him not only alive, but prosecuting his life-work with the utmost vigour and success. Had they been memorials they would obviously have been cast in quite a different form. They would have contained fewer apologetic discourses, and at least some anecdotes and reminiscences of the great departed Apostle, the Founder of all the Gentile churches. They would not only have given particulars of his death, but they would have criticised or commended his character and career. They are, on the contrary, obviously the defence of *Paul the Prisoner*, whose words and actions are all carefully presented and recorded so as to give the least offence to, and to win the most favourable consideration from Roman, Jew, and Judaising Christian. The Acts, from their very form and substance, can only have been, as the great critic Bengel says, "published by St. Paul's desire." They are, unmistakeably, St. Paul's *apologia pro vitâ suâ*, and I have demonstrated that they express St. Paul's peculiar opinions in St. Paul's own characteristic language and figures of speech. Hence whether he wrote every word or not, I venture to affirm that St. Paul is the real author of the Acts. *Qui facit per alium, facit per se.*

The *Guardian* reviewer acknowledges the great importance of the question when he says: "Doubtless all rationalistic theories about the late origin of the Gospel and the Acts are at once exploded if St. Paul was the real author of them." He is, however, haunted by the spectre of "new and formidable difficulties," which in fact is merely a confession that his mind is not open to receive truth in an unwelcome form, or from an unexpected quarter. What degree of weight is due to such biassed criticism as this? What is the evidence, what are the facts? not, what are the real or imaginary consequences? should be the question of the truth-seeker. But, at all events, the editor of the *Guardian* might be impartial. Similar unfair treatment some years ago provoked the Rev. F. O. Morris, the well-known author of the standard work on British birds, to declare that he would never read or write another line in the *Guardian.* One is almost tempted to inquire of what this paper can be the "Guardian," unless it be of the driest and dreariest ecclesiasticism.

H. HEBER EVANS.

August 6th, 1887.

◆

EXTREME UNCTION.

SIR,—Perhaps the most marked corruption of scripture committed by the Church of Rome is in the case of St. James v. 14, 15. Here oil is directed to be used, as a means of wishing a miraculous restoration to health. See Mark vi. 13. If the Church of Rome wanted a form for preparation for death, can she not use the Holy Eucharist, with any devotions she pleases? But no! this will not serve her—she must use, as a *viaticum,* a last rite, what was intended as a means of restoration to health! What absurdity, what profaneness is this! As St. James says, "the prayer of faith shall cure (heal) the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up." And this is used only when cure is hopeless, and as a preparation for the death which St. James prescribed it as a miraculous means of avoiding. Other corruptions of Romanism may be more dangerous, but this is perhaps the most glaring and audacious. A Scriptural rite is used as the regular preface for what it was intended to avoid. Rome dares to do anything!

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—It is regarded so much as a charm, an open Sesame, that in case of sudden death it is used on the corpse—a prayer for recovery after death! But fees must be earned! See article in last number of "month."—Trent calls it *Sacramentum exentium,*" see Dean Plumtre on St. James, p. 104.

◆

Reviews and Notices.

"SOCIAL ARROWS." By Lord Brabazon. London: Longmans, Green & Co., pp. 414.

THOSE who have known anything of the great works of philanthropy which have arisen during the last few years, will not fail to have noticed the name of Lord Brabazon,—now Earl of Meath. He has thrown himself with characteristic energy into all good works; and this volume of essays and papers show the very great interest that he takes in everything affecting the welfare of our young men and the denizens of our large towns and cities.

The first portion of this work deals with the necessity for open spaces,—dealing with the "health and physique of our city populations," a plea for public playgrounds. "Open spaces and the cultivation of flowers," "open spaces and physical education." In the paper on "health and physique" the author comes to the conclusion—

> That the robust and athletic are to be found amongst the well-fed, the well-clothed, the well-housed; that good food and clothing, fresh air and exercise, are necessary to the proper growth of the human frame; and that where these health-requirements are wanting, physical qualities may be expected to degenerate.

Conclusions which every thinker upon the subject will naturally arrive at.

The plea for public playgrounds is extremely well put, and very convincing, and we trust that the suggestions may ultimately be carried out. The third paper, on "open spaces and the cultivation of flowers," is well written and very striking. The author truly asks—

> What occupation can be more elevating than the contemplation of the wonderful power of the Almighty, as exemplified in the beauty and exquisite workmanship with which He has fashioned and adorned the covering of that earth on which it is His pleasure that we should dwell? What pursuit can be better calculated to counteract the debasing influences of city life, where man can find nothing higher to contemplate than the works of his fellow-man?

And he pleads for disused grave-yards to be used for the purpose of flower-gardens. This has been done at St. Paul's Cathedral, and several other of the London churchyards have been utilised for this purpose. We wish that the idea could take root in some of our provincial towns; we have in our minds several large towns with huge disused grave-yards, which might well be utilised for the purpose of flower gardens; howling wastes as dreary as possible; and in many of these towns public parks are a great distance from the homes of the labouring poor. The fear of desecration may be cast to the winds after what has been done in the metropolis in this direction. So, again, the paper on "open spaces and physical education" is well written, and in it the writer pleads for gymnasia to be attached to elementary schools, stating at the same time that

> The body should be trained as well as the brain. At present our system is entirely a one-sided one. We starve the body and overwork the brain, and the former takes its revenge on us by refusing to nourish the latter; the brain, unable to bear a strain which would be no strain if the body were properly cared for, frequently breaks down, and broken health ensues.

The second portion of the work deals with "Associations for the benefit of men, women and children," and among them there is an interesting account of the "Ministering Children's League"—the objects of which are to promote kindness, unselfishness, and the habit of usefulness amongst children, and to create in their minds an earnest desire to help the needy and suffering. The little ones make no promises—they are, however, asked to do at least one kind deed every day, and they are taught to remember that in the home circle opportunities may be found of being kind to others.

Dealing in another portion with over-population, its evils and remedies, the author devotes a great deal of time and space to the subject of "state-directed colonisation and its necessity." There is also a powerful appeal for shop assistants and the Early Closing Movement, and there is also contained in this volume the excellent paper which the author sent to the Church Congress at Wakefield, and which was read by one of the secretaries—on literature and amusements, and concludes with an appeal to "men of leisure" and to "men of wealth."

This volume shows what an earnest-minded layman can do, and we trust that his appeals will be responded to; much may be done if only the right men will take it up; we know that one society especially has been almost entirely kept afloat through the liberality of the writer of these "Social Arrows." We trust that the publication of this interesting volume will be the means of drawing attention to the social evils that exist, and that a right and proper remedy may be found to counteract them.

◆

AT the City of London Auction Mart, Tokenhouse Yard, on Wednesday, the 3rd inst., the advowson and right of next presentation to the vicarage of Chilcompton, Somerset, was, amongst other landed property, submitted for sale by Mr. Robert Burrill. The catalogue described it as comprising a comfortable residence, with a quantity of glebe land, which was all pasture, and a vicarial tithe rent-charge commuted at about £138, and the interest on £300 at 3 per cent., the proceeds of minerals sold on the glebe. It was situated in an improving neighbourhood, about twelve miles from Bath, and in the midst of beautiful scenery. It also enjoyed the advantage of being within easy distance of station, post, and telegraph offices. The present incumbent was seventy-eight years of age. After the lapse of some time there was no offer made, and the auctioneer said he should withdraw the property.

THE Master of the Charterhouse, the Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and Canon Capel Cure, rector of St. George's, Hanover Square, sent the following joint letter to the *Standard:*—"In the now disused burial-ground of St. George the Martyr, at the back of the Foundling Hospital, there is a monument of one whose memory must be ever dear to English Churchmen—Robert Nelson. This monument, which was erected in 1715, with a Latin epitaph written by Bishop Smalridge, is in a sad state of dilapidation and decay, and evidently needs careful restoration. The Kyrle Society, by whose good offices the burial-ground is about to be rescued from its present unseemly condition, has readily given a pledge that this interesting memorial, if restored, should be duly protected. It is for help towards securing such restoration that we desire to make an appeal to Churchmen. Mr. Butterfield has kindly made a careful examination of the monument, and about £60 will be required for its thorough repair, and for surrounding it with a suitable railing. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, of which Robert Nelson was elected a member shortly after its incorporation in 1701, has kindly allowed its office, 19, Delahay Street, S.W., to be used for the receipt of contributions to this object, and we venture to hope that if such contributions are promptly made, the work may be completed during the present summer."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adamson, Rev. Douglas, Incumbent of the new Church of St. Benedict's, Kepler Street, Everton, Liverpool.

Airey, Rev. J. A. L., M.A., Chief Mathematical Master in the Merchant Taylors' School; Rector of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, and St. Martin Outwich.

Betteridge, Rev. John William Abraham Slatter, M.A., Vicar of South Newington, Oxon.

Bradshaw, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Holmesfield, Derbyshire.

Evans, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Snelston, Derbyshire.

Evans, Rev. E. W., Vicar of St. Augustine's, North Shields; Vicar of Cullercoats.

Evans, Rev. Morgan, late Vicar of Llangwyryfon, Cardiganshire; Vicar of Llanddewi-Aberarth, with the Perpetual Curacy of St. Alban's, Tyglyn, Cardiganshire.

Grove, Rev. Philip Sidney, B.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Coventry; Junior Chaplain, H.M. Bombay Ecclesiastical Establishment.

Herbert, Hon. George, M.A., Dean of Hereford; Master of St. Ethelbert's Hospital, Hereford.

Isaacs, Rev. F. W., Curate of Horbury, near Wakefield; Incumbent of the New Parish of St. Thomas, Finsbury Park.

Jones, Rev. Benjamin Harris, B.A., Curate of Llanaber-with-Barmouth, Merionethshire; Rector of Kilymaenllwyd, with the Chapelry of Castelldwyran, Carmarthenshire and Pembrokeshire.

Jones, Rev. Richard Henry, B.A., Curate of Aberedw-with-Llanfareth, Radnorshire; Vicar of Wiston, Pembrokeshire.

Marriott, Rev. F. R., M.A., Curate of St. Mark's, Kennington; Resident Chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester.

Parry, Rev. John, Associate Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the South-Eastern District; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Canonbury.

Perkins, Rev. Charles Edward, Curate of Butleigh; Vicar of St. Matthias-on-the-Weir, Bristol.

Pryce, Rev. Canon, Rector of Trefdraeth; Archdeacon of Bangor.

Rogers, Rev. John Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Weston-on-the-Green, Oxon.

Roulston, Rev. Frederic William, Vicar of Lindsell, Essex.

Southwell, Rev. Herbert B., M.A., Principal of Lichfield Theological College; Prebendary of Lichfield Cathedral.

Spencer, Rev. Henry, Curate of St. Philip's and St. James's, Oxford; Minor Canon of Chester Cathedral.

Stead, Rev. E. D., Vicar of Peasenhall; Incumbent of Christ Church, Richmond.

Thomson, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Carleton Forehoe, with Crownthorpe, Norfolk.

Waller, Rev. Francis Henry, Licensed to Officiate in Diocese of Liverpool.

Ward, Rev. Edward Ewer, B.A., Vicar of Hempnall, Norfolk.

Warner, Rev. Arthur George, Vicar of St. Mary's, Tothill Fields, Westminster; Rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, Cheapside.

Whitby, Rev. Nettleton Balme, Rector of Finningley, Notts.

Williams, Rev. James, Rector of Dinas, Pembrokeshire; Curate of Llanllawer with Llanychllwyddog, Pembrokeshire (during vacancy).

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cosser, Rev. Walter Maude, Priest, for nine years Curate and thirty-six years Vicar of Tichfield, Hants, on the 7th inst.

Heywood, Rev. James John, late of King's College, London, at Mayfield, Streatham Park, on the 4th inst., aged 60.

Lowe, Rev. Julius Conran, M.A., Minor Canon of Durham Cathedral, at 16, South Bailey, Durham, on the 4th inst., aged 65.

Paterson, Rev. George John Mapletoft, forty years Rector of Brome-with-Oakley, at Brome Rectory, on the 1st inst., aged 66.

Richardson, Rev. F. H., Vicar of Belgrave-cum-Birstall, and Rural Dean, at Belgrave Vicarage, near Leicester, on the 6th inst., aged 46.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST.

BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS W. GURNEY. M.A.,
RECTOR OF LITTLE HEREFORD, TENBURY.

SERMON PREACHED AT LITTLE HEREFORD, ON SUNDAY, JUNE 26TH, 1887.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

IT is high time that Christians should breathe freely, more especially imaginative, sensitive Christians, who incline to magnify their own offences until these assume gigantic proportions. For it is not the worst offenders, but those gifted above others with a tender conscience, who have been foremost to conceive themselves guilty of the unpardonable sin. No age, and no sex, and no innocence has been spared. It may be—I cannot say—that an unconsciously exaggerated sense of self-consequence has in some cases gone to fill up and complete the mischief caused by a faulty and deadly interpretation of God's most Holy Word. There is conceivably something dazzling, bewildering, and that causes dizziness, for a sick and excited imagination in the unpardonable blasphemy. To be unlike the rest of humanity, to be hopelessly, irretrievably lost,—there is a lurid grandeur in the idea, at the same time that there is in it despair and madness. It may be asked, Is it not likely that those who have been driven mad by misapprehending the texts bearing on the unpardonable sin, would, if these texts had not existed, have found in some other passage a rock whereon to dash their hopes of salvation? I cannot tell. Be this as it may, the victims are deserving of deepest pity. And let not their blood be on our heads. Every right feeling bids us hinder others from falling over the like painted precipice, which seems to them so terrible, and which is terrible indeed, though not so in their sense. They have not sinned an unpardonable sin; but, for all that, they have wronged their Maker and Redeemer, for they have ignored the master-principle of creation, which is none other than love, and they have nothing accounted of the might of Christ's atonement. And yet, could a record be drawn up of those whose hearts and spirits have been lacerated by this most unchristian superstition—which, if I am not mistaken, has arisen out of Puritan views in comparatively modern times—I suppose that we should have revealed to us some who, in spite of foibles, were among the tenderest lovers and most devoted servants of Christ.

I said just now that no age was spared. I refer the reader, as an instance in point, to an episode in George Borrow's "Lavengro." (See vol. iii., pages 106-143.) My allusion is to the story told by the saintly Welsh local preacher, Peter Williams, a character surely drawn from the life — who, together with his sweet wife Winifred, forms the subject of one of the loveliest prose idylls in the English language. Poor Peter Williams, a man of burning faith and love and zeal, highly imaginative, and withal of a most tender conscience, conceives himself to have spoken the unpardonable blasphemy at the early age of seven! And thenceforth his happiness is wrecked, save in some hours of blessed forgetfulness. But though accounting himself lost—being ignorant of the ransom paid for all—he yet spends his blameless life for God's glory. He gives all, to receive nothing back; how much nobler in this than his idol I need not point out. Not one reproach does he address to his ungracious Maker. Nay, he is meekly grateful for the singular gift of prayer entrusted to him, which yet may avail only for others. The story is touching, but it is more than that. It shows the strength of that delusion which could poison the life-blood of one of God's saints, and rob him of half his usefulness, rendering it impossible for him to trust God, or to preach a Gospel of love. For, what message could he deliver, save one of terror? Can it be wrong if indignation be aroused in a Christian breast that the great God of love should be thus transformed into a base idol of unforgiving hatred. In the sermon which follows I have been far too patient. God is insulted. The forgiveness of sins is ignored. The whole stream of testimony as to God's final mercy is opposed. Forgive me, heavenly Father, for this slowness to take fire where Thy honour is in question! Then do we strike the right chord when we protest, in the name of the Holy Spirit of Truth, against man's misinterpretation of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Can any deluded soul cling to this thrice worn-out superstition, this nightmare of horror, this shallowest grave of hope? As I trust to show in the following sermon, when St. Paul wrote that "All Israel shall be saved," the fallacy in question should have been exploded once and for ever. Reason calmly wonders at it Faith arrays all its forces on the opposing side. The letter and the spirit of Holy Scripture condemn it. The fathers of the Church throw in their testimony against it. Above all, God's love for man renders it impossible.

"Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age (*ἀιῶνι*), neither in that which is to come."—St. Matt. xii. 31, 32.

"Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath not forgiveness for this age (*είς τὸν ἀιῶνα*), but is in danger of eternal damnation (age-long judgment, *αἰωνίου κρίσεως*): Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit."—St. Mark iii. 28, 29, 30.

"And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but to him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven."—St. Luke xii. 10.

"I believe in the forgiveness of sins."—Apostles' Creed.

What is the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost for which there is no forgiveness? That is a question, my brethren, which has weighed on tender and imaginative consciences in our own and in some past generations subject to Puritan sway. It has wrecked innocent lives. It has helped to people mad-houses. It has formed for centuries the deadly riddle of Christianity, more especially for the unlearned, a riddle in time past best left alone, because those who pondered the matter deeply, even though their reason should remain unimpaired, were at the least very liable to incur a lessening of trust in the love and goodness of God, so unspeakably awful was the penalty assumed to be attached to the mysterious offence. And indeed, whether or no men suspected this, herein, in the boundless penalty, lay the true cause for bewilderment. How could any offence, any blasphemy whatsoever, surpass the possibility of God's ultimate forgiveness, to follow upon a sincere repentance?

If in a spirit of reverence, and in conformity with the teaching of Catholic antiquity,[*] I venture to address you on this subject to-day, it is because in our time the Holy Spirit has been pleased to scatter the mists which for so long have concealed from us in large measure the brightness of Heaven. It is being borne in upon us that God is Love, and that He will have all men to be saved. Consequently painted horrors can no longer appal us as of old. The base fears and threats of man cannot avail much longer to hide from us our heavenly Father's face. True, so long as we are upon earth, we must continue "to see through a glass darkly"; but so it is, our eyes are no longer holden, our vision is no longer distorted as it has been by the tradition of the elders as to everlasting punishment. Whilst that evil tradition remained unchallenged, where was the use of questioning that other tradition of the so-called unpardonable sin, its horrible offspring? If God were the author of the one, why should He not be author of the other? Does a little more or less of devilry greatly matter? But now a diviner knowledge is spreading. And Christian hope, which has been so long discouraged and held at arm's length, is speeding back to fill our hearts with gladness; and with the return of hope shall surely come a mighty access of faith and love. Flowers bloom more brightly, birds sing more sweetly; in a word, place is found for Christian joy, since we began to apprehend that God is good. Nor only this. Have you never heard, brethren, this proverb: "Like master, like man"? It is no less true to say: "Like Creator, like creature"; and therefore it follows that a good and merciful God shall have good and merciful worshippers.

But to come to our more direct subject. Inquirers have referred carefully to the actual circumstances under which our Lord denounced the unforgivable sin.[*] The entire passage of Scripture has been sifted sentence by sentence and word by word. And what have men found there? Why, this: a lying accusation, brought against our adorable Lord by men who knew better.[†] There was the essential mischief; they knew better all the while. And note, that a special sin against the Spirit is here denounced, namely, blasphemy, although other and more general sin against the Spirit be by no means excluded. Now blasphemy implies utterance or speech; without utterance there can be no blasphemy. And thus any consciously lying accusation whatsoever, spoken against God or man—our Lord being both God and Man

---

[*] I may, in passing, observe that it is very interesting to note the attitude of the Fathers towards the sin commonly called unpardonable. "The notion," says Bingham, "that most of the ancients had of the sin against the Holy Ghost was not that it was absolutely unpardonable, but that men were to be punished for it both in this world and in the next, unless they truly repented of it."—ii. 921. So Athanasius says of this sin, "If they repent they *may obtain pardon*, for there is no sin unpardonable with God to them who truly repent."—*Ib.* ii. 970. So St. Chrysostom: "We know that this *sin was forgiven to some that repented of it.* . . . What is then the meaning of it? That it is a sin less capable of forgiveness than others?"—*Ib.* 971. So Victor of Antioch St. Ambrose, etc. Two points are very noteworthy, and I ask attention to them, (1.) that these Fathers did not believe any sin to be in itself unpardonable; (2.) that they did not believe the phrases *είς τὸν αἰῶνα* or *αἰώνιος* to mean "never," or "everlasting," as our version renders them."—"Universalism Asserted," p. 178. By the Rev. Thomas Allin, Elliott Stock, Paternoster Row.

I should indeed be insensible if I could enrich my poor sermons from Mr. Allin's stores of wisdom without deep gratitude.

[*] Note that those who committed this special sin were Jews. Now St. Paul assures us—*specially in the case of Jews*—of an universal salvation. "All Israel shall be saved:" his words, as the context shows, being directed not to any portion of the nation, but to the whole. Note further that the sin is carefully defined, "Because they said." etc. This excludes a common and ridiculous gloss, viz., that this sin consists of obstinate and final non-repentance. Besides, this is a pure begging the question, for it quietly assumes that final impenitence is possible (which we totally deny), and which at any rate is the point to be proved, not tacitly assumed.

[†] "It is the sin of the Scribes and Pharisees, *i.e.*, of the hard, narrow religionist—not of the ungodly. The sin itself is very clearly defined, 'because they said He hath an unclean spirit.' Its essence lies in confounding the works of the good and evil spirits, *e.g.*, assigning to God any evil act."—"Universalism Asserted." p. 179.

—is in so far a blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. In the instance before us our Lord's adversaries, knowing and believing that only through the Spirit of God could such power be manifested as He exercised over spiritual beings, maintained, in spite of this their secret convictions, that it was the evil spirit who gave Him this power. This wilful* calumny He denounces as blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. The essence of the sin is, 1st, inward conviction of God's truth; and 2ndly, outward assertion that God's truth is a lie of the evil one. If there were a teacher of an endless hell who in his heart believed in the larger hope—so attributing to God that of which his conscience spoke God free—I suppose that he would be in a strict and exact sense a blasphemer against the Holy Ghost, more especially if he denounced the larger hope as a device of Satan. But in a broad and true sense, whenever we sin against light and knowledge we in so far sin against the Spirit.

And to come to particulars. Unable to deny the conspicuous fact that our Lord cast out devils, the Pharisees affirmed that He did so through Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. This was, I repeat, a more or less conscious falsehood on their part, and was spoken in order that they might by any means, however unfair, discredit Him whom they hated with all the malice of small souls. St. Mark accounts for our Lord's anger in different words, which yet are to the like effect: "Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." Now, we may oppose an enemy as stoutly as we please; but there is one thing we may not do, even to an enemy—we may not, as the saying is, "poison his wells," that is, we may not consciously blacken his noblest actions. And this conscious lie of the Pharisees amounted practically to that. For it was to affirm that our Lord's very works of mercy and charity, which could only be effected by Divine power, and which were the great external testimonies to the truth of His teaching, were themselves wrought by the power of the evil one; so that the more wonderful those works might be, such as the raising of the dead to life, they would only stamp Him, the Lord of all righteousness, as doubly the devil's child and agent.

Our dear Master showed great patience. He argued with these base men, pointing out that neither house nor kingdom divided against itself can stand, and that in like manner if Satan were to cast out Satan there would be an end to Satan. He made appeal also to the fact that their own children, that is, believing Israelites, cast out devils, and asked, "By whom do your children cast them out?" adding, "therefore they shall be your judges." He told them that the kingdom of God was come. And it was only when they remained hardened and shameless that at last His most just indignation broke forth. Then it was that He denounced the sin of these Pharisees as a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. At the same time He was graciously pleased to say that certain sins should he forgiven unto men: "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him"—forgiven, as I apprehend, outright. His enemies might assail Him as much as they pleased, honourably, and from conviction, and their blind fury should not be reckoned to them at all. Our Lord could and did love His honest adversaries, and these, we may venture to hope, formed a considerable part of the Jewish nation. It was only wilful malice that He resented. And so the Lord continues: "But whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age, neither in that which is to come." Hear also the parallel passage in St. Mark's Gospel: "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath not forgiveness in this age, but is in danger of age-long punishment." If by these solemn words our Lord had signified that the punishment due to the sin of these base men should last for ever and ever, then would His malice—God forgive the word!—have surpassed theirs in infinite proportions.* But so far from this being the case, the question of everlasting punishment is not so much as raised by our Master's words.† Those words imply that all manner of blasphemy which is spoken in ignorance, as, for instance, the honest denial on the part of an unbeliever that Christ is the Lord, or that there is so much as a God, shall be forgiven unto men—as it might seem, shall be forgiven freely. But conscious blasphemy, the blasphemy against the Spirit, shall not be so forgiven. Let me emphasise my meaning here. Forgiveness in this passage stands for free forgiveness. A sin of ignorance may be blotted out, a wilful sin cannot be, but must be punished here and hereafter.

Now this assurance of a ready forgiveness for sins of ignorance and prejudice has attracted little notice or gratitude from men. As in nature a smiling foreground is apt to be disregarded if the background be darkened by the approach of a tempest cloud, so here what is tender and reassuring is unheeded in view of the inconceivably terrible punishment reserved for blasphemers against the Holy Ghost. And this is hardly to be wondered at, seeing how greatly fear outweighs hope in the tradition-burdened mind of man. And yet, before we pass on, I invite you, my brethren, to note how smiling is this same foreground of which I have spoken, and how sweet and radiant are its flowers. Forgiveness, direct and absolute, for all blasphemies proceeding from ignorance and prejudice—in a word, for all honest or unconscious offences—what a royal gift is this! This free forgiveness may cover the very mocks and stripes and inborn brutality of the ignorant Roman soldiers, when they maltreated the Lord of all. This free forgiveness may cover the murderous cries of the deluded Jewish people, deluded by their own appointed teachers, when they cried, "Crucify Him, crucify Him!" This free forgiveness may cover the tortures inflicted upon Christians by Christians, who doubtless, in some cases, supposed they were doing God honour; and no less may it cover the honest doubts and denials of many unbelievers to the present hour. And this free forgiveness, we shall all feel, is worthy of the great and good God with whom we have to do. Now were it not for the dark and sullen thundercloud in the background, ready to dart forth never-ending lightnings, we should surely praise and magnify the Lord for His goodness.

---

* Yes, wilful, or at least quasi-wilful, *i.e.*, a sin which a man perfectly knows to be a sin, or at least ought to know—can, if attentive, know

* "The popular view," says Dr. Littledale, "puts God on a moral level with the devisers of the most savagely malignant revenge known to history."—*Contemp. Review.*

† "This passage is wholly silent as to endless torment; the harshest view of its meaning does not involve that—a fact generally forgotten. The words translated 'never' are, literally, 'for' or 'during the age,' and rather imply that after that indefinite period forgiveness may be had; especially so when the repeated and unequivocal promises of the restitution of all things are considered."—"Universalism Asserted," p. 179.

But our gratitude is checked, is nipped in the bud, by the dire meaning men have too commonly assigned to that which follows: "But the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men," and "whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age, neither in that which is to come." The terrible fear lest we should have been, or yet should prove, guilty of what is assumed to be an everlastingly unforgivable offence, prevails over any comfort that we otherwise might derive from the gracious assurance that sins of ignorance and prejudice—here spoken of as sins against the Son of Man—shall be forgiven outright.

And now it is time to ask, Does the faintest shadow of a ground exist for understanding our Lord to have denied mercy for ever and ever to blasphemers against the Spirit, that is, to the very worst offenders? Nay, any such idea has to be imported into God's Word from without, since assuredly it is not there. For how then could we read in God's Word, "Love never faileth," and again, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw *all* men unto Me"? Where is the assumed everlasting denial of mercy to be found? Here, if anywhere: "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age, neither in that which is to come." Well, my brethren, if the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost cannot be forgiven outright—for this is all that our Lord affirms—he must be chastened, chastened in this age and in the next age, must go away with all that are under a curse into age-long pruning (*εις κόλασιν αἰώνιον*), before he can be reconciled to God. Strictly speaking, and in this sense, none who are condemned to any punishment can be said to be forgiven.

You see by this time that the distinction proper to the several passages before us is one between a forgiveness that is outright and a reconciliation that can only follow upon grave punishment. And all the while, dear brethren, men stood on the very brink of this truth without being able to perceive it. They brought their own gloomy prepossessions to the consideration of the matter, and so they gave themselves no chance. Their hearts and brains were filled with the evil tradition of the elders, and so the Word of God became in their hands, all unconsciously, an instrument for slandering, ay, for blaspheming, the Almighty. For them the very waters of life, the Holy Scriptures, were poisoned. If men could have brought themselves to believe in a God of Love they would soon have perceived that the punishment denounced by our adorable Lord against the worst of sinners must have a merciful limit. With what face otherwise could the Apostle have written, "And so all Israel shall be saved"? But men have put the worst construction upon our Lord's words, a construction equally opposed to the letter and the spirit of His recorded speech.

It is unconsciously to insult God in the highest degree to say that He will never forgive or accept the condemned sinner. If anything could be an unforgivable sin we might conjecture that it would be to affirm this, attributing, as it does, implacability to Deity. But I hasten to add that the men who have set forth an implacable God have done so acting only upon deep and strong conviction. Theirs has not been in any sense a sin against the Holy Ghost—that is, a sin against light and knowledge—but rather the sin against the Son of Man, for which there is prompt and full forgiveness. They have wept holy tears in setting forth the dreadful conviction of their souls. Whilst we must needs differ from them, we can love and honour. In all innocence they have insulted their Maker. What! we may say to them, No forgiveness? And what becomes then of the sentence in the Apostles' Creed. "I believe in the forgiveness of sins"? And where is the power of Christ's atonement, as it is written, "He hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself"? No mercy for ever and for ever? Surely these are words that invite, nay, that compel rebellion, shutting out as they do the possibility of repentance. These words. "no mercy," are more cruel and relentless, above all more opposed to God and goodness, than any other conceivable thought of man's heart. When the souls in bale long, at last (in very truth under the Holy Spirit's untiring influence), to attain to purity and holiness, when in a word they seek after God, when the prisoners in the pit turn to their stronghold, then this abiding rampart of fire is to stand between them and any acceptance nay, this rampart of Divine indifference, if not Divine hatred—for as such it is pictured—is to hurl them back to everlasting despair? It is not to be believed, for it were to make God the author of continuous sin and blasphemy; it were to make God an offender. And no such words, no such thought, as that God will withhold mercy for ever and ever, are to be found in the original tongue of His most holy Word.

Now hear once more those words, "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven* him, neither in this age neither in that which is to come." You have seen how base a lie that was which our Lord was here reproving; and say, Would you wish it to be forgiven freely, like to those unconscious offences against the Son of Man? Don't you think that sort of sin deserving of grave, nay the gravest punishment? I am sure you do. Well then, if so, your sense of right and wrong is in accord with our blessed Master's teaching. For He says that such a sin, and we may add, such a class of sins, as He is denouncing, cannot be *forgiven*, that is, not forgiven outright. What follows then? Why that it must be punished in this age and in the next following age as well, before it can be cancelled and remitted. Any other meaning than this does violence to our Lord's words, and comes of abject terror. What, let me ask, follows here on earth upon all sufficient punishment? Why, reconciliation, mercy, to be sure, at last. When we are about to put an offender to death, a murderer say—though we cannot forgive him out and out—we do not go on hating and abusing him; we pity him rather, we send a clergyman to read and pray with him, we give him all the consolation in our power. And shall man be more pitiful than God?

Who are they then that shall be punished? Most gravely of all, those who commit that class of sins against the Holy Spirit which called forth our Master's indignation, together with those who have gone nearest to so doing. But after these, most deserving of punishment shall surely prove they who have sinned any sin whatsoever against the light, against their better knowledge, in a word against the Spirit. For, broadly speaking, brethren, the two classes of sins contemplated by our Lord are sins of knowledge and sins of ignorance. It is almost inconceivable that we should commit the identical blasphemy against the Spirit which our Lord so sternly rebuked. Tormentors of themselves,† who conceive that they have committed the unforgivable sin, are not likely—whilst knowing better—to have accused our Lord, and that publicly, of working His miracles with the devil's help! But it is only too certain that we may and do commit countless sins against the light, and therefore in a true and real sense against the Spirit. And as these sins differ in heinousness, so shall our punishment for them differ in degree.

In what respect, it may be asked, shall punishment in the next age differ from punishment in this age? I will try to tell you. For one thing, it shall be more awful, more long-enduring, more strictly proportioned to the offence; but next, it shall be more blessed in its effect upon the sinner. Dare we imagine that He who bids us forgive our enemies will never forgive his own? Are we to forgive, and rightly, until seventy times seven, that is practically always; and shall God sooner or later come to an end of His forgiveness? I am using the word forgiveness in the sense in which God uses it, not strictly, but in the sense of ultimate acceptance, and thus of mercy. Why, my dear brethren, we have said all our lives in the belief, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." We have never said, I believe that certain desperate offences shall remain for ever unforgiven or uncancelled. The Apostles' Creed bears testimony that God is in that sense a forgiver of sin. God be praised, no evil tradition has found its way into the Apostles' Creed. And most surely do we build on the might of the Atonement to avail ultimately for the sins of the whole world.*

But ultimate forgiveness or showing of mercy does not exclude punishment.† What are you yourselves, my brethren, apt to say to a child that, knowing better, has told you a malicious lie—that in lying has perhaps thrown blame upon innocent people? Supposing the child to entreat to be let off all punishment, what do you answer? If you have a parent's heart you will be apt to say, "No, my child, there is no forgiveness for you, but punishment, grave punishment, that you may learn to amend your ways." But do you mean never to forgive your child again? God knows it is because you love the child that you punish it. And shall our heavenly Father be less loving than an earthly parent? ‡ I am ashamed to ask the question, but am compelled. Sickening is that tradition which can only live by denying all fatherhood to the Father. Have you forgotten the words, "Our fathers verily for a few days chastened us after their pleasure; but He for our profit, that we might be partakers of His holiness"? (Hebrews xii. 10).

---

* If God punishes, He does not strictly forgive, but He reconciles to Himself. It is the interpretation of the word *forgiveness* on which all turns.

† Can any really persist in tormenting themselves with this ghastly nightmare? Would they but consider the wrong they hereby do to God! Like a child that says to its mother, "I would not hurt *you*, mother," when that mother seems about to strike, so let them say to God, "I would not thus deal with you, my God." And then let them ask themselves, Are they gentler than God?

* Rather, as St. Jerome says, is the whole of Creation a field all too narrow for the scope of the Atonement.

† Rather, final pardon hinges (nay, all pardon of sin) on retribution: "Thou, Lord, art merciful, for Thou renderest to every man according to his works"—a passage perhaps the most suggestive in the whole Psalter.

‡ Will the upholders of the traditional creed tell us exactly, (1) when God ceases to love His child; and (2) how He can cease to love it, being at once essentially Love and essentially changeless?

But you may ask, And is that really all that is meant by this terrifying passage of Holy Scripture dealing with the sin for which there is no forgiveness? Are you not holding back from us some damning fact? Nay, for that would be a grave offence against the Holy Ghost, from which God preserve us all. As I live, brethren, the words which I speak unto you are, in my belief, the words of "truth and soberness." True it is that in the passage from St. Mark's Gospel, which forms one of my several texts, a threat is held out in our Authorised Version, of "eternal damnation"; but all educated men know that these frightful words "eternal damnation" do but signify age-long judgment, or judgment that shall endure for an age or ages."*

And what shall I now say by way of brief application? See, brethren, what an offence in God's sight is a conscious lie, a lie prompted by malice, above all a lie wilfully calculated to make God's truth appear the devil's falsehood. How truthful should we be in intention if we would be the disciples of Him who is the Truth, and if we seek to follow the lead of the Spirit of Truth. How fairly we should deal with adversaries. Wilfully to mis-state their case should seem to us nothing less than monstrous. Therefore should we ever be on our guard against the spirit of partisanship. Let us even dare to be stout for any fact that tells against us. Yes, let us gladly seem fools rather than knaves. And let me say plainly that a malicious lie is of all lies the worst, and comes nearest, broadly speaking, to the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, for which there is no forgiveness. Be sure no such lie can be forgiven here or hereafter. Here indeed the anguish preceding and accompanying a true repentance may in itself constitute sufficient punishment, whilst hereafter our crown may have but a jewel the less. But again I say, no such lie can go unpunished; our Lord Himself says so. Nevertheless even in His wrath God thinketh upon mercy; and Christ has died for all. Finally, brethren, let us take comfort in the Psalmist's glorious words from that psalm which it is good to repeat as an act of thanksgiving after Holy Communion: "The Lord is full of compassion and mercy, long-suffering, and of great goodness. He will not alway be chiding, neither keepeth He His anger for ever" (Ps. ciii.).

◆

THE Bishop-designate of Sodor and Man (Archdeacon Bardsley) will preach his farewell sermon at St. Saviour's, Liverpool, on the 28th inst.

KNOWING CHRIST.

By the Rev. JAMES HAMILTON, B.A., Rector of Dunboyne, Co. Meath.

Sermon Preached in Dunboyne Church, on Sunday, July 24th, 1887.

> "Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more."—2. Cor. v. 16.

THESE words are evidently connected with the verses which go before. St. Paul has been showing in vv. 14, 15, that Christ is the Head and Representative of the whole human race. "One died for all, therefore, (as in the Revised Version) all died; and He (*i.e.*, Christ) died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who for their sakes died and rose again." This is the statement of the relationship of Christ to the whole human race. "Wherefore," says the Apostle—as the result of having learned to judge or consider that Christ and His people are one, so that in His death they have died, and in His life they live—"Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now, henceforth, know we Him no more." Now this, which may have appeared sometimes to us as an obscure verse, if we will just look at it carefully may teach us some very useful lessons. There are two clauses which especially deserve our consideration. The first declares the relationship into which St. Paul and all Christians have been brought through Christ to their fellow men. "Wherefore, henceforth know we no man after the flesh." The Apostle had learned to look upon his fellow-creatures in a new and different light from that in which he had looked upon them once. Formerly a Jew was everything in his estimation. No doubt before his conversion he shared the prejudices of his countrymen. And what were they? The rabbis tell us, "a single Israelite is of more worth in the sight of God than all the nations of the world; every Israelite is of more value before Him than all the nations who have been or will be" (Giekie). This is the way the rabbis at whose feet St. Paul had been brought up looked upon all the millions who were not descended from Abraham according to the flesh. He had been taught to consider a man to be a Jew who was one outwardly; who could boast of having some of Abraham's blood in his veins. To him alone the land of Canaan of right belonged; to him alone belonged the promises of God, and with him alone would God have any dealings. Such were his views before Christ revealed Himself unto him on his way to Damascus. He had discovered then that there was not only a God of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles. It came home to him now with all the force of an inspiration, that the true children of Abraham were not those who could claim to have his blood, but those who possessed his faith—that, in fact, if he found the faith of Abraham in a Gentile, then he could not judge of that Gentile according to the flesh, but acknowledged him according to the spirit to be Abraham's child. Or, as it had been revealed to St. Peter, in the case of Cornelius, "In every nation he that feareth God and doeth righteousness is accepted of Him." The Apostle rose far above these beggarly elements of a narrow and restricted Judaism, and entered, and rejoiced that he had entered, into the higher region of spiritual life where there "is neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all." And it was thus having been brought to look upon all men as related to Christ which made St. Paul so devoted a missionary. He believed that every man, woman and child in every nation under heaven were included in the "all," for whom Christ died. And I believe that when the Church of Christ shall have entered fully into St. Paul's idea with regard to mankind that such an impulse will be given to the spread of the Gospel that the glory of the latter days will draw nigh. The Church's mission from her Divine Head is not merely to keep up and maintain public worship amongst professing Christians, and certainly not to drag into her worship the ceremonial of an old and effete Judaism, but to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. Mark you, not to convert the world, but to preach the Gospel to every creature—just simply to tell them the good news of a Saviour who has died for all, to persuade them to enter His kingdom and submit themselves to His service and his laws. But, remember, our relationship to Christ does not make us disregard the outward and earthly distinctions between man and man. These are acknowledged in Scripture, and without them society could not be kept together. Even in the Church of God it is impossible to have all things in common. You remember it was tried in the very earliest period of the Church's history, immediately after the day of Pentecost, to level all distinctions of rank and wealth. In Acts iv. 32, we read that under the direct supervision of the Apostles, it was endeavoured to put this beautiful communistic theory into practice. "No one said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things in common." This was surely beautiful. It was almost like heaven on earth. But alas! it was very short-lived. In the very next chapter we have the record of its miserable failure. It was the cause of lying and hypocrisy on a most gigantic scale. It must have very soon ceased to be adopted, for we find no mention of it afterwards. This doctrine therefore of community of goods—which is so plausibly preached at the present day—the Apostles found to be utterly impracticable in their day. And surely we have no security that it would succeed better now than then. No, my friends, God never intended any social arrangement that would teach any one, rich or poor, to think that it was unnecessary to work in order to eat. The Apostle therefore did not mean to upset or ignore earthly relationships and distinctions. These are necessary parts of all social economy, and will always be necessary so long as time lasts; but yet we should remember that they only belong to time, and can only affect a man's position as a citizen of earth. But the Christian relationship goes on to eternity, and will have its kings and priests, when time with all its accidents of wealth and rank will have ceased to be remembered. "I know no one now," he says, "after the flesh. I know no one now in his relationship to Abraham. I know now no such people as barbarians, Scythians, bond nor free, and yet I know them all as those for whom Christ died—for 'He died for all.'"

---

* Or, as our Revised Version puts it—unsatisfactorily to my mind—"is guilty of an eternal sin," though hereby no injury is done to my argument.

And now we will pass on to look at the second clause of our text, "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more." Some have supposed that St. Paul (Saul), while in Jerusalem prosecuting his studies at the feet of Gamaliel, had seen our blessed Lord and known something of His miracles and His teaching, and that it is to this that he alludes when he says that he has known Christ after the flesh. This is entirely an assumption, and we can hardly believe that if it were true there would have been no other reference to it in Scripture. St. Paul no doubt speaks of having seen Christ, but not previous to the vision on his way to Damascus. Others seem to think that he is refering to the views which he held of Christ before his conversion. This explanation seems to be quite as unsatisfactory as the other. It seems to me that St. Paul is not contrasting his ideas of Christ before and after his conversion, but is rather referring to an advance in his own spiritual knowledge from the time of his conversion. On his way to Damascus Christ was revealed to him as an Almighty Lord whom he had been vainly withstanding; then he passed on from this to learn that this Christ whom he had been withstanding was his truest friend, Who had died for his sake, and was now in Heaven, longing for his salvation. He saw that by the resurrection from the dead He had been declared to be the Son of God with power, and was now able to save to the very uttermost all who would come to Him, and so he passed from the stage of fearing to resist the Lord, to the higher stage of trusting in a merciful Saviour. But still you see that these views of Christ were only outward. He was looking at an external Saviour only, who had done things for him, rather than a Saviour who was living in him. But now he had reached a higher stage of spiritual enlightenment. This higher stage he beautifully expresses in Gal. ii. 20: "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live, and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me." He now looked upon Christ not merely as an external Deliverer, but as living in his Church, and also living in him. And this gives us an idea of the meaning of salvation, which I am afraid is too often lost sight of. People generally think upon Christ as dying to save them from going to hell. They have got the idea that this place is very uncomfortable, and so they are thankful that Christ has died to keep them out of it. The only fear or hatred which they have of sin is its punishment. This is a very low, selfish view of Christ's sacrifice. In the verse preceding our text we read, "He died for all," but for what purpose does the Apostle say—to merely save people from the miserable consequences of their own wrong-doing? Not a word about it, but in order that they who live should henceforth not live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them. We should never cease to thank God reverently and gratefully for His inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ. Our hearts should always be melted at the thought, He loved us and gave Himself for us. But remember that He not only gave Himself *for* us, but that He also gives Himself *to* us; that He died not only that we might be forgiven, but that He died to make us good. Pardon of sin is not the full blessing of salvation. The full blessing is to be saved from sin and become like God. The pardon of sin is just the removal of the burden from our shoulders, that we may press forward with hopeful heart and courageous step towards the mark that is set before us as the prize of our high calling—that mark, which is also the prize, Christ's likeness in the soul. In other words, what our Lord has done for us is only an opening of the way for what He does in us. He redeemed us not to give us back to evil and sin and Satan, but in order that He might take possession of us, and work in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure. St. Paul knew Christ, therefore, not merely as the Christ of history, who lived and died for him on Calvary, but as the Christ who lived in him. How do you know Christ? Do you know Him merely as the Christ who died for you, or do you know Him as the Christ who now lives in Heaven and lives in you? We should never cease to be grateful for the work He has done for us, but remember it will avail very little it it does not lead to His working in us to save us from our worldliness and our selfishness, our meanness and our sin. People have got the curious but false notion that they are under some obligation or necessity to do wrong—I mean the wrong of which the law and society take no cognisance—and therefore that sin cannot be the evil thing which it is said to be, and that we need not fear because Christ died to save us from its punishment. I have no hesitation in saying that this is utterly unscriptural. Thank God, since Christ has died no man is under any obligation to sin. Christ died to destroy the works of the devil. He died for all, that no man might henceforth be under any necessity to do evil, but that in the strength of His grace every man might be enabled to fight not only manfully but successfully under His banner, against sin, the world, and the devil. And here is a practical thought for the close: You and I have our own temptation, or what might be called our besetting sin. You perhaps do not know mine, and I do not know yours, yet we have each our own temptation, as certain as we have our own peculiar form of countenance. Let us remember, then, that we are under no obligation to yield to this temptation or permit it to overcome us, but that we may resist it successfully, and not merely prove victorious, but, as St. Paul expresses it, be more than conquerors through Him who loved us. Do we, then, not merely know Christ as an historical personage, Who died for us on Calvary over 1,800 years ago, but as the Christ Who lives in us, saving us from our sins, and not allowing sin to have dominion over us, and bringing out in us traces of His own likeness, and inspiring us to do some little act each day of self-denial and sympathy towards our fellow-men; and above all as the Christ who "daily beareth our burden" (Ps. lxviii. 19, R. V.). Thus to know Christ is eternal life, and it was certainly this knowledge of Him to which St. Paul referred when he said: "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more."

◆

LAST November the rector of Penarth, the Rev. C. Parsons, asked his curate, the Rev. R. J. Plater, to resign, as disagreeing with him on certain points of doctrine. Mr. Plater, as he states in a correspondence with the Bishop of Llandaff, asked that the matter might stand over till the new year, which was agreed to, he intending to resign in the ordinary way. On December 4, however, he received informal six months' notice to quit the curacy, and a formal notice on February 21, though the Bishop had not communicated according to custom with Mr. Plater. When he wrote to ask the Bishop why he had been dismissed, the reply was that it was in consequence of what Mr. Parsons had stated. Mr. Plater then protested against having been condemned unheard, and again asked for the reason for his lordship's action. Bishop Lewis replied that Mr. Parsons considered Mr. Plater's doctrinal views heterodox. To this the curate rejoined that when he preached Mr. Parsons had never been in the church. On receiving the informal notice, Mr. Plater had asked the Bishop for an interview, but withdrew his request on being advised that the notice was irregular, from which the Bishop drew the inference that Mr. Plater did not disapprove of his rector's action and had no cause of complaint. With the Bishop's consent, Mr. Plater has now published the correspondence, which appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* last Tuesday week.

RHEUMATISM, GOUT,
SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, INDIGESTION, CONSTIPATION, LIVER & KIDNEY COMPLAINTS, NERVOUS DISORDERS, LADIES' AILMENTS, ETC. Promptly Relieved and CURED BY
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
ALL sufferers should read "Harness' Guide to Health," free by post, containing copies of **Thousands** of **Testimonials.** Every man and woman in search of **Health, Strength,** and **Energy,** should at once send a **21s.** postal order to the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.** **52, OXFORD ST.** LONDON, W. and procure one of these famous Belts, and they may rely upon being **CURED**
Corner of Rathbone Place.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1887.

DANGERS AHEAD.

THAT Mr. Gladstone's ascendency should sometimes show signs of returning is not in the least a surprising phenomenon to those who understand the philosophy of party politics. The less a political party becomes an abstraction to the public mind, and the more it becomes centred in some strong personality, the firmer hold will it obtain upon the people. We are very human after all, even in politics, and the sympathies have a tendency to go forth towards men rather than principles. That this is true may be seen from the fact that so many persons have for years followed Mr. Gladstone without in the least believing in Mr. Gladstone's principles. He had, for some years at all events, one great attraction—his policy appeared to be a success, and of course those who followed him upon that ground contributed to make it so. Now, these reflections have an important bearing on the present situation. A great principle is at stake—the principle of the Union. That principle was triumphantly maintained in 1886, and still is safe in the hands of one of the strongest Governments of the century. But already there are signs that many of the people who in 1886 abandoned a man for a principle may within no distant period abandon the principle for the man. If that is the fact the sooner it is recognised the better; for then it will become a question with those, who still place the maintenance of the Union beyond all other considerations, how we shall best secure our purpose under the altered circumstances. The defence of the Church, of the rights of property, of the liberty of the subject, of the prerogatives of the Crown, of the constitution of Parliament; the keeping up of the moral and material power of England, by a farseeing naval and foreign policy; the establishment of real Free Trade against foreign conspiracies to break it dawn; these principles have all passed into the hands of the Tory party after having been abandoned by people who once declared them to be essential articles of their political faith. So far, the Tory party has been successful in resisting attacks upon the institutions it has taken under its care; but that has been the case only when the Tory party has depended upon its own traditions, organisation, principles, and leadership. One after another its allies have deserted the cause they professed, and the Tory party has eventually proved all the stronger for their desertion. Is it possible that in like manner the Tory party is destined to become the one defender of the Union? That question is arising at this moment. There seems to be, in the minds of some, a doubt whether the Unionist alliance lacks those elements of stability and permanence without which no policy can be steadfastly pursued. Not, of course, the alliance in the House of Commons. Nothing could have been more loyal than the support which the Liberal Unionists as a body have given to the Government. But in the constituencies there are signs of a danger that the Unionist party, so long as a dividing line of Liberal and Conservative runs through its ranks, will not continue to excite the enthusiasm it called forth in 1886. It is argued that the want of a unified organisation, of traditions, of concentrated leadership, all tell against it. To the public mind it is an abstraction. If anyone were to ask, "What is the Unionist Party?" the answer would probably be, "The Unionist Party consists of some hundreds of members of Parliament pledged to maintain the Union"; and such a party is too shadowy and impersonal to be readily grasped by the popular imagination. How is it to maintain its hold? What is the Unionist party to do in order to keep its ground? Is it to maintain its duplex character, or is it to find its chief safeguard in a closer unity, so that, associated with a great principle, there may be a revival of tradition, organisation, personal leadership, and the other conditions of healthy party life? Perhaps this may be found impossible. Perhaps the Liberal Unionists throughout the country may resent a fusion which to them would look like merging themselves in a party to which they have been all along opposed. The question for them to consider, of course, is whether they will put this consideration before the Union. If they will, then there is an end of the matter. Like Sir George Trevelyan, who has abandoned the Union in order to bask once more in the sunshine of Mr. Gladstone's smile, they will have made their choice, and we shall know what to think of them. On the other hand, if they determine to protect the Union at all hazards, then they may associate themselves so closely with the party which is going to save the Union from its enemies, as to be practically indistinguishable. The present dual Unionism may be incapable of standing the necessary wear and tear. It won a conspicuous victory last year, but the time may not be far distant when it must be transformed into a homogeneous and undivided party, inspired by a definite cause, appealing to the same past, marshalled by the same organisation, and led by the same leader. This is the goal to which many of the most thoughtful minds are directed, and the means of attaining it deserve serious consideration at the present time.

IN MEMORIAM—MR. C. JACOMB.

In the death of Mr. Charles Jacomb, of Upper Clapton, the world has lost a benefactor and the Church one of her noblest sons. It would be hard to say who will miss him most—the rich or the poor. To the one he was a high-minded friend whom it was good to know as an example of honour, rectitude, and religious devotion; to the other he was a fount of charity which never seemed exhausted.

The only son of his father and a motherless boy, he received a good education at Rugby, and early in life joined his father and uncle in business.

Whether it was the natural sweetness and benevolence of his character, or his brief experiences of reverses which first led him to think of the wants and sorrows of the world cannot be determined, but it is clear that in his early days he formed the habit of those large but unobtrusive gifts which endeared him to the suffering and needy. Most of his gifts were anonymous, or marked only by initials, but there was hardly an institution of any prominence, whether hospital, orphanage, or society, which did not benefit by his contributions.

But it was as a Churchman that his most munificent deeds were done. He had long been treasurer of the Upper Clapton and Stamford-hill Church Fund, which for half-a-century has been largely assisting the leading Church societies in their home and foreign missionary work, when his attention was called to the necessity of further Church accommodation in his own neighbourhood. It was about the time that Archbishop Tait, as Bishop of London, was making his great effort to overtake the spiritual destitution of the metropolis. Calling to his aid some chosen friends, Mr. Jacomb started the project of a new parish, and never rested till it was accomplished. An anonymous donation of £2,500 secured the necessary endowment. Another donation of like amount, also anonymous, provided the nucleus of a building fund, and on the 1st of August, 1866, the temporary iron church of St. Matthew's, Upper Clapton, was opened; and on April 5, 1869, he saw the beautiful church consecrated in which he ever afterwards worshipped.

Schools quickly followed; but even before these were commenced he had organised another effort, and the Church of All Saints', Clapton Park, stands on land purchased by him. In a few years he again launched a scheme, and All Souls', Clapton, which he regarded as the final work of his life, was erected in a poor locality, mainly at his own expense, on a site he had secured before the builders had covered all the ground. It was the last of his public acts to secure that a vicarage should shortly rise on the land which he had presented.

It would be impossible to tell of the many other parishes which shared in his bounty. He did not give without self-denial. Although God had blessed him with wealth, there was careful consideration in his household and abstinence from many luxuries that he might have the more to dispense in charity.

Eighteen months ago a painful malady developed itself, from which he never fully recovered. On the 19th of July grave symptoms appeared, and on the 1st of August—the twenty-first anniversary of the opening of St. Matthew's Church—he passed away, in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

We laid him in the churchyard at Enfield with those of his household who had gone before; and whilst our hearts were full of sorrow because we should see him no more, we yet thanked God for having given such a life to the world, and for having granted us the privilege of witnessing it.

L. E. S.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

STEERING CLOSE TO THE WIND.

Sir,—A High Ritualistic Dublin layman wrote to the *Church Times* last week, lamenting the maimed rites and stammering utterances to be found in even our most advanced Churches. He would have a High Anglican Church set up in Dublin, free from the Synod's authority. To this the editor attached a query, Would that not be a schismatical act? Allow me to answer this, taking that paper on its own grounds, freedom to set at defiance such decisions of courts as one objects to oneself.

Archdeacon Lee advocated such a Church, and Dr. Pusey, *Venerabile Nomen!* offered to subscribe. But is there not a cause? We have thrust into the Church Catechism a question and answer, with the avowed object of denying that the bread is the means of receiving the grace of the Holy Eucharist. This design is to be read all through the Report of the Revision Committee of 1871. That Report professed to take this new question and answer from Art. 28, rather than from the Church Catechism, the latter being "less full." But what does it really do? It gets rid of the words of the Article "given, taken, and eaten." Why? because they imply the priest as giving, and the bread as eaten! It adopts the "less full" language of the Church Catechism "taken and received." Though this was done for a purpose, exclusion of priest and bread, yet why could not the new preface tell the truth, and say that the new question and answer are taken from the Article and Catechism conjoined? Why? I suppose, because after saying in the report that they resorted rather to the Article than to the Catechism, they were ashamed to say that it was really to the Catechism that they *did* resort; and that, for the very reason, that they wanted to get rid of the "giving and eating" of the Article, which they professed to follow as fuller and more exactly theological. At any rate, for whatever reason, there stands in our new preface, an absolute falsehood. A question and answer taken from two sources, is professed to be taken from only one; and the language of them is adopted not from the one pretended, but really from the other which it said it would ignore as less full but which it really preferred because it *was* less full; whilst it set the other aside, which it told the world it followed, as more exact and orthodox. All this is enshrined in the New Preface *in memoriam perpetualem* of the heterodoxy of the Revision Committee of the Irish Synod of 1871. Does not all this call for some protest, if setting up a rival Church would be too extreme a measure? At any rate, if law is to be obeyed here, it should also have some respect shown to it and its courts, with you.

EVEN HANDED JUSTICE.

◆

FEDERAL UNION.

SIR,—Your leading article with the above title lies before me. Your space has forbidden expansion, but there is much left to be read between the lines. May I ask you to give, in your next issue, the *preamble* of the "National Church Association." Of all the indefinitely definite schemes I have read, this scheme is pre-eminent.

I must follow your leading article's lead in leaving much to imagination, while I ask for more explicitness. To those who have followed "Church Expansion" no more need be said. My friend Archer Gurney paid a just tribute to THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT, in expressing his belief in its influence reaching beyond its own circulation. "Brains must rule in the long run." The use of man's *thumb* has been put down as a distinguishing mark against man having an ape for his GREAT grandfather. My right distinguishing mark from not having an ape as my great, great. . . . father, is my excuse for not expressing further my belief in your views, viz., that disestablishment would be welcomed before accepting the late Master of Haileybury's Bill.

My feelings and historical connection with a definite Church, lead me to ask Academics and Canons for an explicit definition of a Bill before Parliament in the way of *preamble*, viz., defining terms.

A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, Gloucestershire, August 15th, 1887.

◆

LAST week Mr. William Cook, auctioneer, Hexham, offered for sale by auction at the County Hotel, Newcastle, a number of freehold properties in East and West Allendale and Bywell St. Peter, Northumberland, the property of Mr. W. B. Beaumont, M.P. The bidding was almost *nil*, and of the thirty-two lots offered not a single sale was effected. Amongst the lots put up was the advowson of the living of Ninebanks and Carshield, with the perpetual right of presentation. It was stated that the living was worth over £200 a year, and the present incumbent was eighty-two years of age. The first bid of £20 was made by Mr. George Tweddell, of Newcastle, but the auctioneer declined to accept it. A gentleman in the company then remarked that the presentation to Ninebanks Church belonged to the rector of Allendale, and that it was a thorough disgrace to the country to endeavour to make money out of church property. No further offer was made for the advowson, and it was withdrawn.

THE Bangor Diocesan Conference was held on the 11th inst. at the Penrhyn Hall, Bangor, under the presidency of the Bishop. The following were elected to represent the diocese on the Central Council:—Clerical—the Revs. T. W. Trevor, rector of Penmon, W. Edwards, vicar of Bangor, and H. Rees, vicar of Conway; Lay—Major T. E. J. Lloyd, Plas Tregaian, Llangefni, Mr. J. Lloyd Griffith, Holyhead, and Mr. R. Thomas. Colonel Sackville West was elected a member of the House of Laymen, in the room of Lord Boston, resigned. A discussion then ensued on a paper read by Mr. E. Powell (Llanidloes), on the question whether the conference might not meet occasionally in the archdeaconry of Merioneth. Eventually, at the suggestion of Bishop Campbell, the principle that it was desirable to hold the conference in different places was affirmed, and, on the proposal of Dean Lewis, it was decided that the Bishop be requested to nominate small standing committees from the archdeaconries of Bangor and Merioneth. The report of the Diocesan Lay-Workers' Association stated that the number enrolled was 270, 158 men and 112 women. It is believed that this is the only diocese in which women are eligible as members. The following resolution on the tithe question was proposed by Mr. J. R. Williams (Treffos):—"That this conference of the diocese of Bangor, consisting of the clergy and lay delegates, desires to express its thanks to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for the firmness with which they have resisted the demand for the reduction of the tithe rent-charge, upholding the principle that tithes are a first charge upon the land, and as such are due to the titheowner to the amount settled by the Act of Commutation, subject only to the fluctuation regulated from year to year by law. Also that the thanks of the conference are due to those landowners in this diocese who have assisted in allaying the present agitation by recognising their responsibility, and themselves paying the tithes chargeable on their property." He considered that the present agitation had done incalculable good to the Church in Wales. The inquiry which was being held had brought out the truth. Every shilling allowed by the clergy in abatement went into the pocket of the landowner, whom in these hard times the clergy could not afford to assist. Alterations might be necessary in the tithe laws, and he thought that the period of seven years was too long for calculating averages. He hoped the landowners would not oppose the Tithe Bill, for they could now show whether they were true and honest friends to the Church. Mr. Powell seconded, and the Rev. Eleazer Williams supported the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

ANOTHER large party left Liverpool on 11th inst. for Canada, under the care of the Rev. W. Dunn, vicar of St. Matthew's, Leeds, who has been appointed to take charge of this party as one of the chaplains of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Mr. Dunn will hold regular services during the voyage, and will as far as possible see that the people are properly settled in Canada. It should also be stated that matrons are appointed to look after the single women. Another party will leave about the middle of next month.

THE Bishop of Salisbury has appointed the Rev. H. J. White, M.A., Christ Church, Oxford, to be acting Vice-Principal of the Theological College of Salisbury. Mr. White will also act as domestic chaplain to the Bishop, and will continue his work of assisting the Bishop in preparing the edition of the "Latin New Testament of St. Jerome." Mr. White was placed in the First Class of the Theological School in 1883, and was Denyer and Johnson Scholar 1884.

THE Rev. H. W. Dearden has just resigned the living of St. John's, Holloway, and accepted that of Southborough, Tonbridge. Mr. Dearden has been a most indefatigable church builder. During the eleven years he has held the living his efforts have resulted in the erection of three churches, to each of which a district has been assigned, and two mission chapels, and a fine Church institute is in course of erection. Mr. Dearden was the first vicar of St. Paul's, Maidstone, where he built a parsonage, schools, and other parochial buildings.

THE Bishop of Chichester lately paid a visit to his old parish of Middleton, Lancashire, and was received most cordially. On Wednesday, the 3rd inst., in presenting an address of welcome from the town council, the mayor, Mr. H. Heywood, said that, though he could not remember the old board of surveyors, which preceded the corporation, and over which Dr. Durnford used to preside, he could remember the old school where he was so many years under the Bishop's care. In reply, Bishop Durnford, after a compliment to the mayor, told how the insanitary state of the town induced him to consult with others and led to the formation of the board of surveyors. The same evening the Bishop preached to a crowded congregation in the parish church, from Rev. xxi. 22. Recounting the improvements that were made inside the building before he left twenty years ago, he said that the Lancashire atmosphere was causing the outside to decay, and suggested that a beginning might be made by repairing the parts that had crumbled away as means were found, and so awakening zeal more and more till the whole was restored. The next day the Bishop gave the rector £20 towards the restoration fund, and before he left on the Saturday paid many visits to his old parishioners.

THE Rector of Great Comberton, near Pershore, who met with a carriage accident near Pershore on the day of the Worcester Jubilee Review, still lies unconscious, at least, unable to speak. In other respects the graver symptoms are subsiding.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arnold, Rev. Cecil North, B.A., Vicar of Bulford, Wilts.

Bather, Rev. Henry Francis, M.A., Rector of Sutton.

Bishop, Rev. Hubert Eustace, B.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Poole.

Blomfield, Rev. Arthur, Rector of Beverston, Gloucestershire; Rural Dean of Dursley.

Brown, Rev. Johnston C., Curate of St. Simon's, Hammersmith; Associate Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the North-Eastern District.

Carter, Rev. Vernon Robert, M.A., Curate (Sole Charge); Rector of Almer, Dorset.

Chamberlain, Rev. G. S., S.P.G. Missionary at Herring Neck, Newfoundland

Cotton, Rev. J. Stapleton, Chaplain of Holy Trinity, St. Servan; Chaplain of St. Servan and St. Malo.

Crane, Rev. George, S.P.G. Missionary, St. John's Outports, Newfoundland.

Dolby, Rev. Reginald, Chaplain to the *Malabar*.

Durrant, Rev. C. Aubrey, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Wetherby.

Godden, Rev. John, S.P.G. Missionary at Trinity East; Rural Dean of Trinity Bay, Newfoundland.

Hatfield, Rev. Charles H., Curate of Christ Church, Southport; Vicar of St. Philip's, Southport.

Hewitt, Rev. John, S.P.G. Missionary at Burin, Newfoundland.

Horsefield, Rev. F. J., Curate-in-Charge of St. Thomas's, New Hey; Incumbent of the Albert Memorial Church, Manchester.

Hurst, Rev. Robert, Vicar of St. John's, Newtown, Macclesfield.

Innes, Rev. Williamson Rust, B.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Hereford.

Johnson, Rev. John E. S., Chaplain to the *Orontes*.

Karran, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of Rickling, Essex.

Lees, Rev. Alfred Harry Benden, Head Master of the Choir School, York; Vicar of Ferry Fryston, Yorkshire.

Ley, Rev. Augustin, M.A., Curate; Vicar of Sellack-with-Kings Caple, Herefordshire.

Merrick, Rev. Robert, M.A., Rector of Puttenham, Herts.

Powell, Rev. F. G. Montagu, M.A., Vicar of Milborne St. Andrew-cum-Dewlish.

Williams, Rev. William, Rector of Whitechurch; Vicar of Llanfair-Nantgwyn, Cardigan.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barnwell, Rev. E. L., M.A., at Melksham House, Melksham on the 9th inst., aged 75.

Conway-Hughes, Rev. John William, M.A., at Nydd Vicarage, Yorkshire, on the 13th inst., aged 63.

Cosser, Rev. Walter Maude, Priest, for nine years Curate and thirty-six years Vicar of Titchfield, Hants, after a very short illness, on the 7th inst., aged 70 years.

Daniel, Rev. Charles John, of Lewes, for many years Vicar of Hope, Derbyshire, at Hastings, on the 6th inst.

Drake, Rev. John Tyrwhitt, at Cottesbrooke Rectory, on the 13th inst., aged 66.

Forde, Rev. Arthur Frederick, late Vicar of St. Peter's, Eltham, at Sandgate, on the 11th inst.

Hand, Rev. Henry George, formerly Vice-Provost of King's College, Cambridge, and late Rector of Hepworth, Suffolk, at Highfield, Godalming, on the 12th inst., aged 76.

Merriman, Rev. Henry Gordon, D.D., Rector of East Woodhay, at East Woodhay Rectory, on the 10th inst., aged 63.

Newcombe, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Granborough, Bucks, at Scarborough, drowned whilst bathing, on the 12th inst., aged 42.

Richardson, Rev. Frederic Henry, Priest, Vicar of Belgrave-cum-Birstall and Rural Dean, at Belgrave Vicarage, near Leicester, on the 6th inst., in his 46th year.

Rose, Rev. Hyla Holden, M.A., at Norfolk Road, Edgbaston, on the 14th inst., aged 75.

Scott, Rev. George Henry Cussans, late Rector of Rhos Crowther, Pembrokeshire, on the 11th inst., in his 77th year.

Thurston, Rev. Joseph, late Canon of Colombo Cathedral, Ceylon, at Guernsey, on the 8th inst., aged 68.

Torkington, Rev. Charles, Rector of Almer, Dorset, at Clearmount, Weymouth, on the 13th inst., aged 69.

Wetherall, Rev. Charles Augustus, Chaplain to Her Majesty's Forces, at Montreal, Canada, suddenly, aged 57.

Wollaston, Rev. Charles Buchanan, Honorary Canon of Chichester Cathedral, formerly Vicar of Felpham, and late Vicar of Amport St. Mary's, at Park House, Reading, on the 11th inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

RETROSPECTION.

By the Lord BISHOP of CHESTER.

The Commemoration Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, June 19th, 1887.

> "I will mention the loving kindnesses of the Lord, and the praises of the Lord according to all that the Lord hath bestowed on us, and the great goodness toward the house of Israel which He hath bestowed on them, according to His mercies and according to the multitude of His loving kindnesses."—Isaiah lxiii. 7.

THE love of retrospect is not peculiar to any single form of natural organisation, or of moral development, or sense of personal achievement. It is so common, indeed, among men, that one is tempted to estimate its value and importance rather by the conditions of those who have it not, than by the varied constitutions of the many who have it. The *laudator temporis acti se puero* may be one whose school days have been pure and happy, and whose later life has been in bitter contrast; or one whose early life was full of hardships which the glow of later successes has made to shine with the pride of victory; or one to whom a placid and little varied career of usefulness and continued habits of friendship, comfort, and goodwill, seems to have started in congenial circumstances that have never suffered a break or a shock. The very happy man and the very unhappy man may join in the pleasure of looking back. And, on the other hand, some men turn away with a shudder from it, find it full of painful memories, sins that no repentance has yet availed to annihilate, recollections that summon up the blush of shame, although victory has been won, and great love swallowed up the consciousness of the great things that have had to be forgiven—and to them the things that should have been pleasant are poisoned by the sense of misuse, wasted opportunities, misemployed abilities, duties betrayed, hopes not so much disappointed as cast away. And with the love of retrospect there is a kindred feeling of gratitude; the successful man recognises his debt to the circumstances and companions and conditions of the past: he knows that neither himself nor his fortune is really of his own making; pride of achievement is in all who have deserved success closely bound up with the realisation of indebtedness: inherited taste and skill, early training, the father's loving correction, the mother's earnest prayers: the honest character of the family, the kindness of the first encouragement, the glory of the first prize at school, and so on. And whoever has not the love of the retrospect, or the feeling of gratitude, has, we are prone to think, something wrong about him; experiences for which he cannot forgive himself, which he cannot forget because they tell most tellingly against his conscience, and are not to be merged in the contentment that they are past and gone for ever. Well, in a sort of way, we all know, institutions are like human beings; they have a past and a present; they have a debt to the past which is to be paid to the future; they are the children of their own past, the parents and sponsors of their own future; they have early hardships and bygone glories, they have laws of growth and hopes of infinite development; they have personal loves, and shames, and honours, and hatreds, names in the past of which they are ashamed, others in which they glory; brilliant exploits which have led to nothing; unpretending industries that have given consistency and conserved life; sense of growing powers, and will to conform to the reign of change; a struggle between growth and inertia, between liberty and order, between the desire to hold fast all that is worth holding and the desire to grasp after all that is worth grasping. I think that all institutions that are worthy of the name have this, from the great Church of the living God (which in its outward, earthly and personal aspect is subject to the fortunes and conditions of all other institutions) to the humblest grammar school or friendly society that has a sense of corporate character and identity. I am sure that it is true of such a body as ours. And as in the personal aspect of the matter, the sense for good or for evil is strongest in those who have the greatest and most intelligent personal consciousness, so it is in this. The institution lives in the heart and sense of the men who realise its preciousness, identify themselves with its history, know their own part and duty in its developments, recognising alike their debt and responsibility; love what it loves, and hate what it ought to hate, in the true spirit of old allegiance. All this is a very obvious thing; it is of the very essence of a commemoration utterance in church or out. In church it certainly must be combined with a distinct recognition of something higher still; of the gracious disposition of divine providence guiding, and developing and revealing, and of the duty of thankfulness for mediate and immediate gifts: from Him from whom all Holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed, whose service is perfect freedom, and in the knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life, the Giver of wisdom and understanding, and counsel and ghostly strength, and knowledge, and true godliness, and the fear of His holy name: from Him we know come to us both the desire to know, and the growth in knowledge, and the purpose to use all knowledge to the increase of His glory; all comes of Thee, and of Thine own is all that we have to give Thee, to whom be all honour, praise, thanks, and blessing, from us and from all who shall follow us. In our recognition of this is contained and sanctified our recognition of the secondary causes of blessing and gratitude; our gratitude for the training that has made us, as an institution, as a University, what we are, and for the share in the training, and its results which has given to us personally and individually all that constitutes our intellectual, and influences, for good and for growth, our moral and social life in this place. We feel that we have our share in making our Oxford; we know the share that Oxford has had in making us. With the utmost humility, with the utmost and heartiest sympathy, we dare to identify ourselves with the University of the present, and to claim our lineage from the long past. We are not content merely to hold fast what we have inherited; we desire to develop and increase the position that we may hand it on to our children brighter, fuller, more living and true than ever, by the law of life that shall not be broken. But the desire to develop and increase it implies our sense of the value of the past, of the glory of the lineage of the line and direction of the training, of the grand and eternal purpose which each of us in his generation and portion is trying to observe. There is no dead hand of the past laid upon our present, as we desire to lay no dead hand of ours on the future that for most of us lies so very near; but we have a treasury of experiences, and of aspirations, and of prayers and hopes, and we have tried to build a little on the foundation other than which no man can lay, for the illustration of the truth, and the edification of the land, and nation, and Church, which we know ourselves to be set to serve. We have a lineage of teachers and learners as well as of founders and benefactors, of scholars and statesmen, of priests and philosophers, of thinkers and workers, whom we desire to recognise as members of our great family, and helpers with those who have gone before, and with those who shall come after, and who shall, we trust, bless us as we thank God for our predecessors, helpers with all who seek after wisdom. I need not speak much of this, speaking to men who live in the consciousness of how much has been given, and how much must be required. There cannot be one amongst us, who however little he may think of his debt to the past, and however he may undervalue what he inherited in comparison with what he has himself contributed to the growth of his subject, the development of his mind, and the achievement of his position does not, in his experience of Oxford, look back on some leading influence—a tutor, a friend, a library, a chapel, what you will—which has helped to make him what he is, and without which he would not have became what he is. And surely there are very many amongst us who would gladly confess that their debt is unbounded, and that they owe all that they know to be good, or humble, or modest, or real, to the influence under God of some such surroundings. There are countless founders and benefactors over and above the givers of lands and endowments. There have been many such in our own experience; there are still. The noble scholar devoted to the development of his own pursuit, whose eye and heart and hand have ever been ready to seek out, encourage, and help the beginner. The patient tutor who would devote his scanty leisure to the cultivation of the backward lad. The man of God whose personal effluence and influence, under the grace of the giver, was powerful to attract to all manner of goodness. The laborious worker, whose entire devotion was an example to all who could take example; the acute thinker and critic, whose kindly cruelty could and did so much in the pruning and training; the man who instinctively we felt could be trusted; the close friend to whom we could dare to speak unrestrainedly of our ambitions and our fears, and whose sympathy we knew could never be turned aside into jealous rivalry or ungenerous betrayal. And they before us had their debt, as those before them had theirs, a debt for more far than maintenance or even instruction, for the experience of wise ways and the inheritance of many prayers. For who that believes in the power of prayer can question that the accumulation of the devout supplications of sincere and holy men, for those who should follow them and take up their work here, have reached the ear of Him whose heart is set on His people; or that, like prayers of parents for their children, the efficacy of which we test and prove daily, their prayers for us are duly answered. But these things are a very great mystery. The coming week will be marked, I imagine, by a good deal of retrospection all over England and the English world. A reign of fifty years is a distinctly appreciable portion of the life of the world, and affords a test of growth, and of the rate of accelerating change which men will calculate, it may be, their own way, but of which no one can doubt the importance. We are, as a nation, thanking God for so long a period of honest, and pure, and peaceful government; for the grace that has guided the heart and mind of her who, coming as a helpless girl to a position too critical for the strongest man in his own strength, has governed her people with unparalleled devotion and identification of herself with them, through a period of changes and developments also unparalleled and still advancing. Fifty years: ten such periods take us back to the days at which most of the old colleges were founded, ten more such periods to the days when England was being moulded into one State. Were there ever such fifty years before? Yet could this reign have been what it has been but for the work of the half century that preceded it? For good and for evil, for the variations of the struggle, for the prospects of the victory, for the sowing of the tares as for the sowing of the wheat, each age inherits as each has to contribute its quota. The Jubilee year of George III. looked back on a half-century, which for its wonderful eventfulness, its astounding shocks of change, its character for the summing up of consequences, and for the fructification of causes, its destructions, and its constructions, its uprootings out, and pulling down, and destroying, and burning down, and building, and plantings, was unparalleled among the changes of the most High; and yet we ourselves have lived through great things, and had our part in changes of the old order, and seen in many ways the renewal of the light of the countenance of our God upon us. Fifty years have seen the development of our colonial empire, the absorption of India, the constitutional autonomy of our great settlements in the southern hemisphere, the *alter orbis* of the latter days. Fifty years have seen the land we live in covered with a network of railroads, created and utilised by miraculous efforts of engineering skill, spreading in their growth a vast industrial population, and bringing, wherever they reach, the needs, and supplies of the needs, of social well being. Fifty years have seen the elements of light and electric force made to serve the purposes of men in ways only imperfectly dreamed of before. Fifty years have witnessed two great constitutional changes at least in our own land which have been wrought out in peace, and would fifty years earlier have been effected by nothing short of revolution. Fifty years have proved to us that the Church of our baptism has shared humanly the revived energy of all the electric work that has gone on around us, and that in and by her, as of old, the right hand of the Lord has shown its pre-eminence; her sound also has gone out into all lands, and her daughter and sister Churches are doing the work of her God among colonies, and in the midst of the heathen too. At home, the easy-going contentment of the reign of George IV. has, in the things of the Church, been exchanged for the full and vigorous vitality of the age of Victoria; the shabby old churches have passed into new and glorious offerings for the dwelling-place of the most High, homes for the souls of His children, bidding them by every stimulus that can affect mind and heart, to lift themselves up to the Lord. The service of the sanctuary has ceased to be a burden of un-understood or misunderstood devotion, and those who sing with the spirit have again learned to sing with understanding also, for the growth of education has, so far as these things go, helped to train men's minds up, and together—up into purer air, and together into closer sympathy. And the education of the people at large has made a wide stride; no child now without a school, and a stimulus, and vigilant guardianship, and a prospect of a higher, more useful, fuller, nobler life. And in this place, too, a centre of national feeling, of Church life, of educational enterprise, of the pursuit and growth of knowledge, fifty years have made their mark indeed: in extended freedom, which God give us grace to use aright, and in widened sympathies, which God give us grace to govern wisely, and in the grand lesson of faith, the sure policy of casting our burden on the Lord. We are speaking of joy and thankfulness both here and everywhere, but we do not forget the dark shadows; we know that at this very moment we are in a crisis, a crisis nationally and politically, which, however it ends, will not leave us as it found us. We know that with national changes social and religious changes must come; we know that there are pessimists now who tell us that we are under the pressure of evils which we cannot bear, or the remedies either; we know that all these changes, and many of the influences of which I have spoken, are not confined to our own nation or its kindred, but are working in all the world, and maybe working towards an altered system of relations between east and west, north and south, liberty and absolutism, even civilisation and barbarism. But we will remember the years of the right hand of the most High, and, remembering our training and the discipline of our history, hold fast for the purpose for which God has raised us up. Crisis—yes, but we are all and always in a crisis, every day is a trying time; it is something to recognise the fact and prepare for the issue. Changes must come; yes, but there is something still that is unchangeable, the rock round which these changes circle, but which standeth sure, the Gospel of faith, and love, and duty, life and immortality, and the certain victory. We can bear neither our vices nor their remedies; the hosts of Egypt behind, the walls of the Red Sea, right and left and before us; but the very pursuit of the enemy shows that we have shaken off the slavery, the faith that is guided by the pillar of fire and cloud is sure of its reward. The great lesson of a true Commemoration of the past is a faithful, and certain, and loving hope for the future. It is a recognition of a debt, and therefore a duty; a consciousness of bygone victories, and inherited honours, and holy associations, and ennobling efforts; victories that shall be surpassed, honours that shall be duly vindicated, associations that shall never be broken down, and efforts which, by the grace of Him who has called us, shall open the way before us to new fields of conquest in the realm of knowledge, and new harvests of blessing to faith, and new and more perfect, more hearty, more intelligent, more sympathetic working between class and class, nation and nation, man and man. As lovers of England, as lovers of Oxford, as English men and as Oxford men, as faithful subjects and loyal, as members of Christ and children of God, let us thank Him who has led us thus far, and hold fast our profession, for He is faithful, and so let us be, justifying His wisdom, the sufficiency of power and the perfection of love.

LIGHT OUT OF DARKNESS.

BY REV. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, ON SUNDAY, AUGUST 7TH, 1887.

> "The Lord my God shall make my darkness to be light."—PSALM xviii. 28.

IF we may rightly say so of a servant of God uttering inspired words, we see David at his best in this eighteenth Psalm. In other psalms he is in anxious conflict with the enemies of Israel, or he is borne down by sorrows in his home, or he is heart-broken with the sense of personal sin. In this psalm he sings as a man whom as the inscription says: "The Lord hath delivered from the hand of His enemies and from the hand of Saul," he can now look back upon the troubles past, and can measure the greatness of the dangers which have beset him, for he is full of inspiring buoyancy and hope. "The sorrows of death compassed me, and the overflowing of ungodliness made me afraid. The snares of death overtook me." In those dark days which preceded his elevation to the throne, David, in his distress, had betaken himself to God, and had been favoured by a special manifestation of the Divine being. "In my trouble"—here the Prayer-book does not help us so well as the Bible—"I called unto the Lord and complained unto my God; He heard my voice out of His temple, and my cry came before Him, even into His ears." And what followed, that which passed before David's soul could only be suggested to others by pictures drawn from the natural world. Those aspects of Nature which strike dread into the heart of man by revealing to him his weakness and his insignificance in the presence of the mighty forces amid which he dwells—the earthquake, the volcano, the pitchy darkness of the heavens, the roll of the thunder, the flash of the lightning, the pitiless onset and torrent of the storm, these might suggest, they could not portray, the overwhelming impression of the presence of God upon the soul of David. "The earth trembled and quaked, the very foundation also of the hills shook and were removed, because He was wroth. There went a smoke out in His presence, and a consuming fire out of His mouth, so that coals were kindled at it. He bowed the heavens also, and came down; and it was dark under His feet. He rode the cherubim and did fly; He came flying upon the wings of the wind. He made darkness His secret place; His pavilion round about Him with dark water, and thick clouds to cover Him. At the brightness of His presence His clouds removed; hailstones and coals of fire. The Lord also thundered out of heaven, and the Highest gave His thunder; hailstones and coals of fire. He sent out His arrows and scattered them; He cast forth lightnings and destroyed them." This was the purpose and object of the vision. David's deliverance from his enemies was the work of no human strength or skill, but of the unseen Master whom David served, and therefore he is so buoyant and hopeful as he looks forward into the future.

The future had troubles in store for David, troubles in his family, troubles with his subjects—worst of all, troubles that would come of his own misconduct; but, be the future what it may, David can rest upon the moral certainty that he will still enjoy that illuminating and strengthening presence of which he has had experience in the past. His subjects may be rebellious, his trusted councillors may fail him, his natural powers may yield to the decay which comes with years, but the strength and consolation of his life will still be with him. He may for a while be untrue to that light which has shone with such kindly strength upon his path, and yet, if he has not parted with the will to serve, if he can but turn and repent, God will give him the comfort of His help again, and will establish him with His free spirit. "The Lord my God shall make my darkness to be light."

This buoyant confidence in a light that will not fail in the dark hours of life is eminently Christian, and David's words which express it are words which a Christian, more than other men, may press most closely to his heart. For we Christians know who has said: "I am the light of the world," and we can reason. He has said it. He—our Lord and Saviour—has taught us, by appearing among us, what God is, He has taught us what man is, and what man through Himself again may be; but He has also lighted up the darker mysteries of our human life with knowledge and hope such as, but for Him, we could never have enjoyed, so that we may repeat David's words with a conviction of their truth more intimate and more robust than David ever could feel: "The Lord my God shall make my darkness to be light." For let us observe that there are three dark shadows which fall across every human life—the shadow of sin, the shadow of pain, and the shadow of death.

There is, first of all, the shadow of sin, which falls dark and thick upon the life of human beings. Sin is the transgression in will or in deed of the eternal moral law, of that law which, unlike the law of nature, could not be other than what it is, unless God could be other than what He is; of that law which is not the arbitrary enactment of His will, but the outflow and expression of His very being. Sin itself is the contradiction of God, it is the repudiation of God, the perverse activity of the created will, which, if it were pushed to its natural consequence, would fain, if it could, frustrate God. Only when we thus contemplate the true nature of sin do we feel that the language of the Bible about it is not exaggerated, and that there is justice in the stern sentence—"The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Not that sin as the Bible represents it is always an act; often it is a state, it is an attitude of the will, it is an atmosphere of mind and disposition, it pervades thought, it insinuates itself into the springs of resolve, it presides over life where there is no conscious or deliberate intention of welcoming it, it changes its form again and again; at one time it is anger, at another envy, at another sloth, at another outrageous self-assertion, at another degraded imagination. But throughout it is one in its root and principle, the resistance of the created will to the will of the Creator; and this resistance means darkness not in the sky above our heads, but far worse—darkness in the moral nature, darkness in the moral intelligence, darkness at the centre of the soul, and as He who knew indeed what we are has said: "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" This darkness was felt in the degree possible to them by the heathens. It explains the vein of sadness which runs through the highest heathen literature, for the heathen, too, could sin, since they had a law written on their hearts, and when they broke it they had experience of remorse and shame—remorse and shame, those mysterious protests of the human soul which emerge from its depths, unbidden, unwelcome, in the train of sin. For us Christians, of course, sin is blacker and the shame of sin is greater in proportion to our higher knowledge of God and His will. Chorazin and Bethsaida cannot, if they would, be as Tyre and Sidon. In order to escape from this dark shadow, men have tried to persuade themselves that sin is not what we know it to be, and the conscience which reveals it to us is only prejudice or a bundle of prejudices accumulated through centuries of human life; but this desperate experiment to get rid of the inward monitor does not succeed with any who have carefully watched the inner chambers of the soul, and who know that the imperative secret bidding, "Thou shalt," "Thou shalt not," is just as much a part of the soul's very structure as the faculty of thought, or imagination, or memory. No; the shadow of sin cannot be conjured away; it lies thick and dark upon human life, and sinners as we are, we can only cry out in words well known to us: "Lighten our darkness, we beseech Thee, O Lord! and by Thy great mercy defend us from sin this night, for the love of Thy only Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ." Has not this prayer been answered: "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world"? "He was made to be sin for us, which knew no sin." But He does remove our sin by paying the debt of justice in His own person, and by uniting us to Himself, so that His acts and sufferings become ours, and therefore if we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins. Upon us, sitting as we are in the darkness of the region of the Shadow of Death, there shines the sun of his pardoning love, and He, our Lord and God, in very deed makes our darkness to be light.

And then there is another shadow following hard upon the shadow of sin as being not seldom its consequence—the shadow of pain. What pain is in itself is a question that cannot really be answered. We know it by its presence, by its effects. There may be persons, high spirited, young, happily circumstanced, without experience of any but the sunny side of life, for whom the pain that is suffered daily, hourly, momentarily in this our world has no meaning; but for others, and a large number, this problem of pain is a distressing, even an overwhelming one, which they cannot put away from them. Just let us think for one moment how many thousands out of the four millions of this metropolis are at this moment in acute pain, whether of mind or body; and yet what a mere speck are they in the great empire of pain—that empire so ancient, so varied, so unimaginable! It is pain which dogs our steps from the cradle to the grave; it is the monopoly of no class; the infant at the breast, the old man bowed beneath his fourscore years, the stupid and the intellectual, the wealthy and the poor, the good and the bad—they all have their share in this inheritance of pain. And pain is not limited to man's bodily constitution; the mind is capable of sharper pain than any that can be caused by a diseased or wounded body. No; pain is not merely human; the lower creatures, of whose real place and purpose in God's universe we know so little—they, too, are evidently subjects of the rule of pain. And as the races and generations pass, whatever else may distinguish them from each other, whatever else they may have in common, they pass, each and all, sooner or later, under the weird shadow of pain. How to deal with pain; how to alleviate it; how to do away with it—these have been questions which men have discussed for thousands of years. Anodynes there are for pains of body and pains of mind, anodynes of very varying moral worth, but of which this must be said, that they do but at most curtail the fringe of the great realm of pain. "Man," says a thoughtful writer — "Man has learned many things, but he has not learned how to avoid sorrow; among his achievements how to safeguard against wretchedness is wanting." Nay, it might seem that the aggregate of man's unhappiness has increased with his increase in culture, and that the acute sensibility and multiplied sources of distress more than outweigh the more numerous means of alleviation at man's command, Yes, pain remains, on the whole, inaccessible to human treatment, and especially does it resist attempts to ignore its bitterness. Single men or schools of thinkers may have endeavoured to achieve indifference to pain; but take men and women as a whole, and however bravely they may strive to lessen or bear the measure of suffering which comes with duty, which comes with life, yet they will at times utter the prayer: "Lighten our darkness, we beseech Thee, O Lord! and by Thy great mercy defend us from this great pain, for the love of Thy only Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ." Pain in the world of Nature often warns against that which endangers life as in the case of hunger, in the case of extreme cold, or in the case of internal disorder. But the Lord of life needed no such warning, and yet He was the sufferer, Pain in the world of men is the consequence of wrong-doing; but "our Lord did no sin," "neither was guile found in His mouth," and yet He was the sufferer—nay, He was the greatest sufferer that the world ever saw. Man suffers more than the animals, the higher races of men suffer more than the lower. With such a bodily frame as His, with such a human soul as His, our Lord must have possessed a capacity for pain of which our relatively coarse and dull natures can possibly form no adequate conception, and so the prophet saw him across the centuries as having "a visage marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men." As the Man of Sorrows our Lord showed that pain is not to be measured by the reasons for it which we can trace in nature; it has more and larger purposes, which we can only guess at, but as associated with resignation, love, sanctity, pain is most assuredly the harbinger of peace and joy. On the cross its triumph was unique; it availed to take away the sin of the world. On the cross we read two mottoes, which transfigure the realm of pain: "By His stripes ye are healed," and "If we suffer we shall also reign with Him."

And, once more, there is the shadow of death—death which is ever round us; death which, sooner or later, comes to us all. The thought that death must come at last casts over thousands of lives a deep gloom. There is the uncertainty of the time and manner of its approach; there is unimaginable experience of what in itself it will be; there is the dread of man as to what may, or may not, follow it. No real comfort is to be had by reflecting that the laws of nature are irresistible. We may sometimes witness the utter misery which is caused by the visit of death to a family made up of people of warm affectionate characters who have parted with Christian faith. Death lays his hand on this son or daughter, and then all these questions are asked by the aching hearts, and no mere human speculation can really answer them: What has become of him? Does he still exist, or was death the last moment of existence? Can we hope to see him more, or is all really over, as really as though he had never been? Only one prayer will help these sufferers, if they only had grace to repeat, "Lighten our darkness, we beseech thee, O Lord, for the love of Thy only Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ.'' The darkness of the grave is not less lightened by our Lord and Saviour than is the darkness of sin or the darkness of pain. He has entered the sphere of death, and with Christians death is no longer dark; through death Christ our Lord overcame him that had the power of death—that is, the devil—and delivered them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage; the lamp of His dying love is our light through the gloom.

In most generations there appear to be Christians who miss the bright light which is thus shed on us by the Divine Redeemer, as though it were better to grope their way through the darkness of sin and pain and death by the aid of the pale lantern of human speculations. Some well-known illustrations in our own day may readily occur to us, but it is for many reasons better to select some more ancient example of this signal misfortune. For many ages there was no book of merely human authority more highly thought of than the "Consolation of Philosophy," by Bœthius. Not to go beyond the limits of our own country, it was translated in one century by King Alfred, in another by the poet Chaucer, in another—at least partly—by Queen Elizabeth. And the consideration which it thus enjoyed in England was by no means exceptional, it was but a sample of the common mind of Europe about it down to the end of the sixteenth century. The popularity of the book was due partly to the fact that it embodied much of the best wisdom of the old pagan world, and partly to the tragic circumstances under which it was composed, and which were well fitted to cast a spell upon the imagination of later times. Bœthius had been the trusted councillor of Theodoric, the second and greatest Gothic king of Italy after the fall of the Western Roman Empire. Bœthius was probably the most honourable man of his day, and he stood as high as any in the estimation of his brave but illiterate sovereign. He was accused of conspiring to re-establish the old Roman imperial power in Italy at the cost of his Gothic master, and upon little or no evidence of guilt he was thrown into prison at Pavia, where, after lingering nine or ten months, he was put to a cruel death. It was during this imprisonment that Bœthius wrote the "Consolation of Philosophy." As we read it we never forget the author's circumstances. He paints first of all his own deep dejection, and then, personifying philosophy as a lady who had the air of having lived through centuries, yet bore upon her still the signs of youthful vigour, he describes her visit to his desolate cell. She sits on the edge of his bed, and looking steadily into the face of her downcast disciple, addresses him in words of pity and of reproof. He tells her his trouble, and she displays the consolation she has to display to the mind of man. True, Bœthius has lost everything in his outward condition that had made his life bright; but philosophers have always known the worthlessness of external advantages. The highest good—which is not wealth, or office, or friendship, or popularity, or noble birth, or brilliant reputation—is still within the reach of Bœthius, but this highest good can be none other than the Supreme Himself. Still, there is the fact, Bœthius urges, that in this world the bad often do get on very well, while the good are cruelly wronged. And here Philosophy does not help him much, as she insists on the Stoic idea that the wise man alone is free. And then there follow discussions in which many interesting things are said about providence and faith, and about human free-will and Divine foreknowledge. He suddenly breaks off at the fifth book at the point when the executioner enters the cell to end at the same moment the life and work of the illustrious author. Undoubtedly the treatise on the "Consolation of Philosophy" insists that the world is ruled by God; but it carries us no further. It passes sin by, and deals with pain as the Stoics dealt with it—as something to be somehow ignored or overcome; it has little to say on the supreme mystery of death. It might have been written by one of the more respectable Deists of the last century, but, in fact, it was written by a Christian, who, as we know from other sources, took a great interest in the questions that agitated the Christian Church 1,300 years ago, who must have had in his hands the holy Gospels, the Epistles of St. Paul, the writings in which the great Augustine had shown to the world the full meaning and power of the inspired record. How is it that Bœthius, in the solitary weeks and months which closed his earthly career, could fall back upon what heathendom had to give? Why is there no mention of the Cross with its atoning virtue for human sin, with its sanctifying power for human pain, with its sustaining consolations for the last agony? Was it that, in the secret soul of Bœthius, Plato and Proclus had as high, or even a higher throne than that which he assigned to our Lord Jesus Christ? Was it that he could not free himself from the academic or literary prejudice which often cannot reconcile the preaching of the Cross with the dainty tests and requirements of literature? We do not know; but whatever be the explanation, it is impossible to escape from a feeling of sadness at the spectacle of so beautiful a soul, surrounded by such rich opportunities, yet so tragically missing them. Bœthius remains a typical specimen of those minds of Christendom for whom Christ has not made their deepest darkness to be light.

Sin, pain, death—these are the three shadows that fall across the life of man, and that our Lord makes these dark shadows to be light is the experience in all ages of thousands of Christians. St. Paul, for instance, knew that sin was darkness; but he knew also that in himself Christ Jesus had shone forth on long suffering. St. Paul was no Stoic in the estimate of pain; but he said that "the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." We hear fears or hopes, as the case may be, sometimes expressed that in the coming years religion will lose the power which it has had over the thoughts and lives of men. "All things change," men say, "in our modern world, and if to-day religion lags behind in the march of change, she will have to follow suit to-morrow. The ideas and beliefs which are here are doomed to disappear." Well, brethren, we will not now discuss this bold prophecy; but let us observe that, at least, certain elements of human life which are matters of our personal daily experience, and which are most intimately bound up with the life of religion, do not change with the advancing years; they remain what they were, unchanged in a changing world. New figures may appear upon the public scene, new ideas may fill the ear and govern the lives of men; the outward form of our civilisation may vary, the centres of power may be shifted, the frontiers of nations may be enlarged, may be contracted; the speech of men, if only sufficient time be given, may become utterly different from what it is or has been: if one man's life could be protracted through three or four centuries, the changes which he would witness would be indeed astonishing, he would find himself, in very many respects, in an utterly new world; but certain things would not have changed, they have never been other than what they are. Sin, pain, death—are what they were in the days of the Tudors, in the days of the Crusaders, in the days of the Apostles and Evangelists, in the days of David. Sin, pain, death—they are the permanent elements in the life of human beings, and because they are permanent, religion, too, will last. Only a robust faith in the unseen, only the faith of our Lord and Saviour, can relieve the human heart when face to face with the solemn and irremovable conditions of our life. If the sense of sin could be drugged by a false philosophy; if pain could be forgotten in a sustained ecstacy of self-sufficiency; if chemical science could only arrest the march of death, then the religion of Jesus Christ might die; but as matters stand it is too intimately associated with the fact of human life, it strikes its roots too deep into the most tender experiences of the human heart. So long as men sin and suffer, so long Jesus Christ our Lord will be believed in, will be worshipped as the Light of the World, as the Divine Master whose teaching and whose death have made the darkness of human destiny to be light. He and His mercy enable each one of us, while yet we may, to know this by a blessed experience, to know Him, our adorable Lord, as the Conqueror of sin, not less than as the Atonement for sin, to know Him as the consecration of pain, that at the last we may know Him as the perfectly trusted Guide, who will lead us through the Dark Valley of the Shadow of Death into that land beyond the grave of which He Himself is for ever the everlasting life.

THE TRUTHFULNESS OF GOD, AND THE MANY-SIDEDNESS OF HIS TRUTH.

BY THE REV. WALTER B. MONEY, M.A.,
RECTOR OF WEYBRIDGE, SURREY.

SERMON PREACHED AT ALDEBURGH CHURCH, SUFFOLK, ON SUNDAY, AUGUST 14TH, 1887.

"Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side."—PSALM lxxxix. 9 (Prayer Book).

THE key-note of this Psalm is to be found in the 3rd and 4th verses, in which the Psalmist summarises the promise of God made to David in the 7th chapter of the second Book of Samuel: "I have made a covenant with my chosen; I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I stablish for ever, and set up thy throne from one generation to another." The "I" in these two verses does not mean the Psalmist, as in the opening verses of the Psalm, but God. These two verses stand alone, and the rest of the Psalm grows out of them.

To explain further, the Psalm was evidently written in the later days of the Jewish monarchy, when the throne of David was tottering to its fall, and when the prospect was very dark.

The poet wants to rise out of the grief and discouragement of the present. And so he in forcible brevity states the promise of God to which the circumstances of the present seemed such a contradiction. And then the whole of the Psalm is his attempt to argue himself into the belief that in spite of all present appearances God will, must, keep His promise. One of the arguments he uses to himself is what God has done for His people in the past, but that is not his strongest argument.

No, his mightiest argument is the same as that which Job used to himself when he said, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him."

It is the character of God. The whole force of a promise depends on the character of him who made it. He will meditate on the character of God, and then he must be certain that, come what may, God will keep His promise. Again and again in the Psalm he dwells on the truth or faithfulness of God, and on the greatness and perfection of His character.

Read the words which follow the Divine promise, and you will see what I mean:—

"O Lord, the very heavens shall praise Thy wondrous works and Thy truth in the assembly of the holy ones. For who is he in the sky that shall be compared unto the Lord, who is like unto Jehovah among the sons of the mighty. God is very greatly to be feared in the council of the holy ones, and to be had in reverence of all them that are round about Him." And then comes the magnificent climax: "O Lord God of Hosts, who is like unto Thee; Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side."

What a depth of meaning there is in the words if we linger over them; what a roll of majesty in their sound; and what a hush of rest they bring to the soul of a man who drinks them in. "Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side." The first meaning of the words is: "Thy truth is on every side of Thee; Thou art wrapped round with truth," and so we might say that all that the words imply is that God on His throne in heaven is absolute truth; but it is false thus to localise the truthfulness of God. God is everywhere, for He filleth all things, and therefore it is as true to deduce from these words that God's truth is on every side, as that God is in His own character absolute truthfulness.

But I grant that the first meaning of the words is that God is absolute truth, and that therefore every single one of the promises of God must be fulfilled.

Are not the words in this sense capable of bringing a hush of rest to your soul?

When you think of God's promises to you, are you certain that they will be kept, because you know God is absolute truth?

Take the one promise which you may find in verse after verse of Scripture, that God loves you and cares for you, because He is your Father; loves you, cares for you, goes after you when you are in the dust of self-caused degradation, when you are a lost and wandering sheep, when you are a wretched prodigal child, a promise absolutely made when the express image of God bade man pray to God as "Our Father."

Have you never doubted this promise as regards yourself? Have you never thought, "God may love other people, but He cannot love me"? Have you never said to yourself, "I have proof that God does not any longer love me, because I have prayed to Him for help, and no help has come. I have asked that I may love Him more, and I do not love Him enough to obey Him any more than I did"?

Does not this doubting arise from the fact that we do not say to ourselves, "God's promises are utterly different from man's promises; no man is absolute truth, God is." Our experience tells us that no man could love us utterly whatever we were; it is that in us which we know would alienate man's love, which we therefore imagine must alienate God's love; we qualify God's promises by our experience of man's love; we have faith in God's promises for others, not for ourselves; we would tell another just such as we are that God loves him; we cannot believe it for ourselves.

My friend, take a long look into yourself, fathom if you can the depths of your own badness, cast yourself out utterly from all men's, aye, from your own sympathy, and then say: "Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side;" in all my misery Thy faithfulness and truth are my shield and buckler against despair; I am still loved by God, and must for ever be loved by God, because God is absolute truth. I am never forgotten by God; it is harder for God to forget (unless He wishes to) than it is for me to remember. And God cannot for His truth's sake wish to forget me. He wishes to forget my sins when He has taken them out of me, and then He casts them behind His back. But He will never forget them till He has purified me of them. Praised be His Holy Name for that.

To pass from the individual to nations; the same argument is wanted there to save the pessimist from his gloomy despondency. Are we never thinking that all is going wrong, that things look very bad? Do we never sigh after the old times, forgetful that God's promise is that He will create a new earth; that He will make all things new, forgetful that God must, because His truth is on every side, be leading the world on step by step into new and better paths, no matter what the seeming distress and wrongness of the present? God has no more forgotten His promises to the world than He has His promises to you, and the council of the holy ones above knows that, if we do not. Humanity, even redeemed humanity, may cry "how long;" but God's truth says, "Be patient and trust"; and we strive to answer in faith: "Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side."

Now take the words in their more enlarged meaning. God is everywhere, therefore God's truth is everywhere. Man may everywhere see revelations of God's truth, therefore man should everywhere look for revelations of God's truth.

Apply this to the study of nature and the revelations of science.

The cry of modern science, for which religious men are largely responsible, is that God's truth is not on every side, *i.e.*, that the discoveries of science disprove the truth of God's word. I am certain that the cry of more modern science will be, "Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side."

The positive certain discoveries of science (for I do not speak of its guesses) in the last few years have been marvellous. As they advance more and more, they must reveal more and more the might and the beauty of the Divine mind which conceived such things; the belief that there is no mind behind them will become more and more an impossibility. The astronomer, the chemist, the geologist must, as they pass the threshold of each new discovery, exclaim: "Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side."

In the early days of guess-work and experiment they may have been startled by finding themselves face to face with the thought that science and Scripture were contradictory. Later on, in the light of fuller knowledge, they will only discover that the revelations of science have brought to light fresh germs of scientific truth which lay hid in Scripture, waiting till man's labour should unearth them. They will discover that, while Scripture was never intended to forestall man's labour and to reveal scientific truths beyond the knowledge of the day, yet that the mind which conceived Scripture did show an acquaintance with truths, which must have been hidden from the minds of the human agents who wrote.

Science, too, will teach religious men what God means it to teach them, to re-consider their old interpretations of Scripture; that where science is touched upon, it is in the language of the day, often in a poetical form, that the Bible is not meant to teach science. And so the very discoveries of science, instead of contradicting the Bible, will reveal the truth of God on every side in the right interpretation of the Bible, one great truth being that the Bible intended men to discover God in the book of nature by their own patient labour through all the ages of the world.

Again, if we turn from nature to our fellow-creatures we discover God's truth on every side. Let any man watch the lives of his fellow-men, and he will see the truth of God in the blessing that follows obedience to God, and the suffering that follows disobedience to God. Or let him believe that God is everywhere and His truth everywhere, and he has faith to believe in prayer for the growth of God's truth in the heathen nations of the earth. He is ashamed to sneer at missions to the heathen when he believes that God's truth is on every side. His faith prompts him not only to pray, but to unite almsgiving with prayer. "How dare I," he says to himself, "hold back faithless, when I know that in every country of the earth God is, and God's truth is, giving even there a standard of right and wrong, and just waiting for my faith begotten of God to light the lamp so that the heathen may see the truth of God, in God's light seeing light?"

But, my friends, there is one sense in which, more than in any other, I could wish that we all might say with deep, earnest faith: "Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side." In that sense, I mean, which would make us recognise the many-sidedness of truth, and for ever forbid us to encourage in ourselves or in others anything approaching to a narrow party spirit in religious matters, imagining that such and such a party is the sole repository of truth. How could a man belong to a party while he uttered those grand words, "Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side"? What a miserable, dwarfed, stunted thing a party stands confessed by the side of those words.

God's truth is on every side. If God's truth were as you alone expound it, it would be just as if the earth gave birth to only one kind of flower, only one kind of foliage. How bare of beauty the earth would be then. Learn to see the beauty of God's truth in the men who do not think just as you do. Every variety of thought which there is in this congregation, so long as it holds to the few essentials of our Christian religion, is an evidence of the beauty of God's truth. I would not lessen that variety for the world. Each soul is a different soil. God has a different flower of truth which shall blossom from each. The seed which bursts into bloom in one heart will not thrive in another. God keep us from being narrow-minded gardeners. Whether you talk with man face to face, or in the pages of a book, say in your heart: "Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side." And then look for the truth, and welcome it and absorb it, and ponder on its beauty, and let the rest go. Do not fasten on the error, and be blind to the truth; do not be growing ever narrower and narrower, contracting God's truth more and more, but believe in its variety, believe in its omnipresence, believe that the flowers and leaves of earth are its truest and its loveliest symbols. And say: "My truth, the truth that I hold, may be very little and confined, but 'Thy truth, most mighty Lord, is on every side.'"

◆

THE will has been proved of the Rev. J. W. Stillingfleet, Rector of Hampton Bishop, Herefordshire, whose personalty was valued at £21,141.

A BEAUTIFUL stained-glass window has been placed in Wickersley Church, Rotherham, to the memory of the late Bishop Titcomb, of British Burmah. It represents the call of St. Matthew, and contains a good likeness of the Bishop. Mr. Barnett, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, is the artist.

ON Sunday, the 21st inst., as Christ Church, Endell Street, which suffered so severely from lightning in the recent storm, was considered unsafe at present, service was held in the dining-hall of the adjoining workhouse. The insurance company has generously undertaken the principal repairs; but as there is scarcely a part of the church, including the organ, which has escaped damage, much help will be needed to place the edifice in a sound condition.

ON Thursday, the 18th inst., the Bishop of Madagascar (Dr. Kestell Cornish), a former curate of the parish, re-opened the church of St. Thomas of Canterbury, Bovey Tracey, which had been restored by Mr. Sedding, mainly at the cost of the Vicar, the Hon. and Rev. C. L. Courtenay. According to tradition, the church was founded as an act of penance by Tracey, one of the murderers of Archbishop Becket; but the present fabric is in the Perpendicular style. Bishop Cornish's discourse was founded on Ps. xcii. 4. In the evening the Dean of Exeter (Dr. Cowie) was the preacher.

RUPTURE CURED!
IMPORTANT INVENTION.
MR. C. B. HARNESS, the renowned Inventor of Electropathic Belts and other Curative Electrical Appliances, has lately introduced a **new Washable, Everlasting** Truss, known as
HARNESS' XYLONITE TRUSS
A NEW TRUSS.
Guaranteed to **last a lifetime.**
All who suffer from **Rupture** should wear **Harness' Xylonite TRUSS.** It has a beautifully smooth flesh-coloured surface, of a washable and durable material; gives complete comfort and support without irritation; is cheap, and weighs only a few ounces.
Pamphlet and Advice **FREE OF CHARGE**
on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ld.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 27, 1887.

CLERICAL TRAINING.

THIS is a well-worn subject, for it has been discussed at several of the Church Congresses and Diocesan Conferences; and yet, if we judge from recent events, it still occupies a place in the minds of many earnest Churchmen. Some time ago a *consensus* of opinion was arrived at with regard to the examination of candidates for Holy Orders, with the result that nearly all the Bishops have agreed upon certain subjects which are to be brought up by all candidates for Deacons' Orders, so that there will be no safe and easy place for men of meagre attainments to slip into Holy Orders. And we can only regret that this *consensus* was not arrived at long ago. In addition to this, there is now a yearly meeting of Bishops' Examining Chaplains, Archdeacons, and Principals of Theological Colleges, which must of necessity have a salutary effect, not only bringing all together, but in the discussion as to the best means of promoting their work, dealing with vexed and intricate questions, which can only be solved by mutual discussion and conversation. All these things tend to show that there is a movement, the result of which will be seen in a more intelligent, well-read clergy.

In addition to the subjects selected for examination, we should like to see some plan adopted whereby men may show their practical knowledge of things which must come before them. A candidate for Deacons' Orders may have at his fingers' ends all the heresies of the early Church, may be able to repeat the Thirty-nine Articles in Latin, and know the date of every alteration in the Book of Common Prayer since 1549, but when this has been mastered, and he has satisfied the examiners, what benefit will it be to him in after-life when settled down into a rural parish? Practically none at all. It must be clearly understood that we are not condemning the acquisition of this knowledge; far from it. But we think that while this is acquired many important matters are scarcely ever touched upon. For instance: a young deacon is placed in a large town parish, where he will, if he works, meet "all sorts and conditions of men." Suppose he is confronted with an infidel, who has ready all the catch-questions of the infidel, how is he to meet him, to debate and discuss the questions without either lowering his position or showing signs of weakness? So, again, with Unitarians, Romanists, and others, it is well that the armoury should be strengthened. And we should like some plan to be adopted whereby young clergymen could learn how to deal with these questions. Further, we must bear in mind that as there is no new thing under the sun, so also in addition to the Infidelity, Romanism, and Unitarianism that exists, there is springing up new heresies on all sides. We have Christadelphianism, Swedenborgians, Latter Day Saints, not to mention the Agnosticism which is gaining ground, and that spirit of utter indifference, which holds not a few, as to whether there be a God or not, and looking upon religious duties as non-suited for intellectual men, but only fitted for women and children. In the face of these things, it is not sufficient to be furnished with the armoury of past and long-forgotten generations, but to remember that we are living in the nineteenth, and not in the fourth or fifth, century.

So, again, with preaching. If the Church of England is to maintain its hold on the great masses of the people, it must be by her clergy having knowledge of the great problems of the day, to live *really in the world*, and to uphold the truth in all its fulness from the pulpit. The reason why the Church has not as many eminent preachers as she ought to have, is because, in a great measure, preaching has not been taught in the Universities and Colleges. At the same time, we do not forget that "orators are born, not made," but unless a man possesses the gift of utterance, of preaching, what opportunity has he either at the University or in the Theological Colleges of learning how to address people? At the University he may be learning public speaking at the Union, but that we believe is all. And in some of the Colleges the students are accustomed to hold cottage services, but in the short time at their disposal it is impossible for them to learn *thoroughly* the art of preaching, whereas in the Dissenting Colleges preaching is made the most of, and men are encouraged to train themselves for this special feature of their work. The fact remains, if we want to get people to listen, truth must be put before them in as clear and lucid a manner as possible. There is, we are aware, the practical difficulty, viz., how to preach well, and to prepare two and sometimes three sermons every week. If people could be made to understand that one good sermon on the Sunday is sufficient, it would lift a great burden from many a clergyman's heart, and to expect a deacon to preach twice every Sunday, or even three times, as we heard a country rector say not long ago that he considered a curate ought to be able to take three services every Sunday. The result of this high pressure is detrimental both to clergy and people.

And so also, in dealing with men, there is a great field here for clerical training. To gain the ear and heart of working men it is necessary to find out what are their special temptations, and to deal with them accordingly. It would be a good thing if clergymen in densely populated parishes could be allowed to hold short services during the breakfast hour, as is the case at the Midland Railway Works, Derby. And as time and opportunities occur to get into conversation with them, they soon can tell whether a clergyman is in earnest, and if they find him to be such, they will not fail to give him their confidence.

We believe that if something of this kind could be carried out, the Church's mission to the masses would be more felt. The great thing is to have full grasp of the ever-perplexing problems of the day, and to be able to meet them, to help the working men by, as far as possible, "putting yourself in their place," and thus trying to lead them to higher and holier things.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

TWO ROMISH GLOSSES ON JOHN VI.

SIR,—Rome relies greatly on John vi. Two interpretations are extraordinary:—

(1.) Certain were stumbled by our Lord's words, that we should eat His flesh. They went away. Rome argues that they must have understood Him right, because, if not, He would have undeceived them. Thus Wiseman argues:—"Can we suppose that Jesus would have allowed things to come to this extremity, that He would cast away for ever many of His disciples when an explanation in two words would have saved them?"—"Lectures on the Holy Eucharist," p. 154. Again, p. 159:—"He let them depart, though one word of explanation, had He condescended to give it, would have saved them from this apostacy. Neither does He deem it proper to explain Himself further to His chosen twelve." *Ergo*, these people took Him up right; but they were the Capernaites, who entertained an heretical view—p. 114—so this argument proves heresy orthodox!

(2.) There is an equally strange gloss on the words "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." This was in answer to the objection, "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?" How does Wiseman explain our Lord's answer to this difficulty? He says that the flesh, which they wanted to know how they could eat, is the flesh of which St. Paul treats in Rom viii. 1-14. This is the most monstrous perversion that I ever met with, as if they could have thought that a carnal mind, which is death, is a thing to give life by being eaten!

(3.) After this it is unnecessary to refer to what Wiseman says, p. 254:—"His body was able to pass through closed doors, and even penetrate the stone vault of the sepulchre, to the utter discomfiture of all reasoning on the boasted impenetrability, as it is called, of matter." This is all rubbish. Scripture says nothing of passing through closed doors—only that they were closed for fear of the Jews. They might have been opened to admit Him. As to the sepulchre, "an angel rolled away the stone," so that He had the door open for Him! No one says matter cannot be penetrated by a miracle. What we do say is that, if our senses cannot infallibly judge of the presence of any substance by their perception of the presence of their accidents, we have no proof that what the Apostles' sight and touch told them was our Lord's real body, was anything more than its accidents, clothing a spectre or the body of any other man! If Romanism stand, we have no proof of the Resurrection. But Rome would like the world to have no other proof but her word.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

◆

CRATHORNE Church, near Yarm-on-Tees, is to be rebuilt from the designs of Mr. Hodgson Fowler, of Durham. It is an interesting structure of the early fourteenth century, but certain stones said to be of pre-Norman date are built into its walls.

ST. ANSELM'S CHAPEL, in Canterbury Cathedral, is about to be restored, Canon F. J. Holland having offered to defray the cost of work. The chapel lies just beyond the south-east transept, and is one of the few portions that escaped the great fire of 1174. A new vault is to be constructed with groinings similar to those of St. Andrew's Chapel, which is on the north side of the Cathedral, and of the same date as St. Anselm's. The windows will be opened out, and filled with stained glass, and the columns which have perished will be replaced. When the chapel is restored it is proposed to celebrate the Holy Communion there upon special occasions, and also on Saints' days. It is also contemplated to use the chapel for small devotional meetings.

ST. LAURENCE'S, Nettleden, near Hemel Hempstead, Herts, has just been re-opened, and the preacher, the Rev. C. G. Lane, Rector of Little Gaddesden, spoke in feeling terms of the late Vicar, the Rev. G. S. Cautley, who, with his wife, had devoted much attention to the adornments of the church. Many of the windows were, in fact, painted by the late Mrs. Cautley. The work of restoration has now been completed by the patron (Earl Brownlow) and the present Vicar, the Rev. R. T. Ogden, the latter of whom has presented a new reredos as a memorial of his father and mother, the Hon. Mr. and Mrs. C. R. Ogden. The chancel screen has been given by the Vicar, parishioners, and other friends in memory of Mr. Cautley.

THE death is announced of the Rev. Richard Holgate Brown, Honorary Canon of Chester, Vicar of St. Paul's, Stalybridge, and Rural Dean of Stockport. Canon Brown graduated from Christ's College, Cambridge, and was ordained in 1855. His first curacies were at St. Catherine's and St. Paul's, Tranmere. In 1860 he was appointed Vicar of High Lane, near Hazel Grove, which benefice he held twenty-one years.

◆

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alderson, Rev. Henry E., Curate of Mirfield; Vicar of St. Paul's, Peel, Little Hulton, Lancashire.

Bertie, Hon. and Rev. A. E., Rector of Staveley; Rector of Gedling, Nottingham.

Consterdine, Rev. J., Vicar of St. John's, Ashbourne; Association Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the South-Eastern District.

Dodd, Rev. James, Curate-in-Charge of St. Paul's, Rawtenstall, Manchester.

Flack, Rev. G. Sutton, Vicar of Berrington, near Shrewsbury; Rector of St. Clement Danes, Strand.

Griffiths, Rev. W., Vicar of Sedgley, and Rural Dean of Hirnley; Vicar of Great Shellsley Beauchamp, near Whitby.

Hannah, Rev. John Julius, M.A., Vicar of St. Nicholas's, Brighton; Prebendary of Hova Ecclesia in Chichester Cathedral.

Hazard, Rev. J. B., Curate of St. Michael's, Lichfield; Vicar of Cotes Heath, Stone.

Henson, Rev. H. H., Fellow of All Souls', Oxford; Head of the Oxford House, Bethnal Green.

Isaac, Rev. Gerald Moore, B.A., Vicar of St. George's, Claines, Worcester.

Lindsay, Rev. Dr., Rector of St. Clement Danes, Strand; Vicar of Berrington, Shrewsbury.

Powles, Rev. R. C., Prebendary of Seaford in Chichester Cathedral.

Roberts, Rev. Morris, Vicar of Llanllyfni, Carnarvonshire.

Smith, Rev. Isaac Gregory, M.A., LL.D., Vicar of Great Malvern, and Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral; Fourth Honorary Canon of Worcester Cathedral.

Whitehead, Rev. Sydney Farran, Perpetual Curate of Mungrisdale, Penrith.

◆

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barrett, Rev. Alfred, D.D., at Carshalton House, Surrey, on the 20th inst., aged 71.

Brown, Rev. Richard Hollgate, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Stayley, Honorary Canon of Chester, and Rural Dean of Stockport, at Stayley Vicarage, Stalybridge, on the 16th inst., aged 55.

Claxton, Rev. Donald Maclean, M.A., at Merriott Vicarage, Somersetshire, on the 13th inst, aged 45.

Cordeaux, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Hooton Roberts, at the Rectory, Hooton Roberts, near Rotherham, on the 16th inst., in the 86th year of his age.

Grenfell, Rev. Algernon Sydney, formerly of Parkgate, and late Chaplain of the London Hospital, at Aberavon, Cardiganshire, on the 18th inst., aged 51.

Hayes, Rev. Thomas, B.A., at St. Mary-le-Gill Vicarage, Barnoldswick, Leeds, on the 17th inst., aged 87.

Hill, Rev. George, Vicar of St. Winnow, Cornwall, at the Vicarage, Downton, on the 21st inst., aged 74.

Hughes-Hallett, Rev. John Henry, for sixteen years Curate and nineteen years Rector of Westbere, at Westbere Rectory, near Canterbury, on the 15th inst., aged 69 years.

Johnstone, Rev. John, M.A., at Haxey Vicarage, Lincolnshire, on the 17th inst., aged 82 years.

Smith, Rev. Edward Herbert, for forty-three years Rector of Killamarsh, at Killamarsh Rectory, near Chesterfield, on the 20th inst., aged 86.

Walker, Rev. Bryan, LL.D., Rector of Landbeach, formerly Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, at the Rectory, on the 16th inst., aged 47.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE FIRST AND GREAT COMMANDMENT.

A SERMON BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS W. GURNEY,
RECTOR OF LITTLE HEREFORD, TENBURY.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment."—ST. MATT. xxii. 37, 38.

OUR Lord, in His first and great commandment, makes some distinctions in that love which He bids us yield to God; we are to love God with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and, as we are told elsewhere, with all our strength. These distinctions, assuredly, are real; but what is plain above all else is that we should love God very dearly. Which of us makes many conscious distinctions in the love which he yields to an earthly father and mother? As long as we love them with a true affection all shall be well. And yet, for the thoughtful, the distinctions here made by our Lord are, I repeat, very real. Thus, to love God with all our heart is to love Him as we love our parents, with all conceivable affection, reverence, and duty. And to love God with all our soul (a love that He can share with none), is to take delight in prayer and praise and sacrament, and in God's most sacred word. And once more, to love God with all our mind is to exercise the intellect, God's good gift to us, wholesomely and righteously, in the discernment of the Divine nature, and of our special obligations to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three Persons in one God. So, then, there are several kinds of love due from man to God. But, at this time, let me confine my speech mainly to that true heart's love named first in order, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart"; for it is certain that all other love spoken of by our Lord is dependent on this, which, if we only have it, shall please the Father well.

Love, let it be granted, is to a large extent instinctive, as from a child to a parent; it grows with the growth, and is not a mere after-fruit based on the distinct perception of benefits received. Thus, from the very first, love seems due to the All-Creator and All-Sustainer; to love God is a primary duty, only we are not likely to discharge this duty unless we discern His wisdom, love, and power. A Christian may indeed love on trust with full mental satisfaction, but it is certain that love cannot be given for the mere asking, still less can it be given on compulsion.* Harsh and tyrannical parents cannot enforce their children's love. And, where not given upon trust or instinct, love can only be earned by the full deserving, though it is sometimes given when unearned, or partially earned, by good and loving hearts. But in vain are we downright bidden by our sacred Master to love God, unless God appear to us to be worthy of our love. And plainly, not any amount of temporal benefits, if these are to eventuate in everlasting woe, can claim our gratitude. Nay, if choice were ours, I suppose that, with that fatal prospect before us, few of us would care to accept any benefits whatever.* There is an incongruity between temporal happiness and endless misery. It has been well asked, "What would have been thought of the propriety of placing a hundred bright and cheerful objects, suggestive of peace and happiness, in the ante-room to the torture chamber of the Inquisition?"†

Millions of Christians, it is likely, are conscious at the bottom of their hearts that their feeling towards God is one not so much of love as of fear. And why is this? It is because God has been slandered very cruelly to His children.‡

---

* Florence Nightingale has said with great truth and power: "I can't love because I am ordered—least of all can I love One who seems only to make me miserable here to torture me hereafter. Show me that He is good, that He is lovable, and I shall love Him without being told. But does any preacher show me this? He may *say* that God is good, but he shows Him to be very bad; he may say that God is love, but he shows Him to be hate, worse than any hate of man. As the Persian poet says: 'If God punishes me for doing evil by doing me evil, how is He better than I?' And it is hard to answer, for certainly the worst man would hardly torture his enemy, if he could, for ever. And unless God has a scheme that every man is to be saved for ever, it is hard to say in what He is not worse than man, for all good men would save others if they could. . . . It is of no use saying that God is just, unless we define what justice is. In all Christian times people have said that God is just, and have credited Him with an injustice such as transcends all human injustice that it is possible to conceive."—Quoted in "Future Probation," p. 116. James Nisbet & Co.

* Even the prospect of that comparatively insignificant evil, temporal death decreed by law, makes men indifferent, if not averse, to the receipt of personal favours and benefits.

"As they (the rebels who were out in 1715) were led gradually, and by detachments, to execution, those who survived lost interest in mankind, and the desire of communicating with them. I shall long remember what one of them, Ned Shafton by name, replied to my anxious inquiry, whether there was any indulgence I could procure him: 'Mr. Frank Osbaldistone, I must suppose you mean me kindly, and therefore I thank you. But, by G——, men cannot be fattened like poultry, when they see their neighbours carried off day by day to the place of execution, and know that their own necks are to be twisted round in their turn.'"—"Rob Roy," Vol. ii. ch. xx.

† The Rev. Thomas Allin.

‡ They who now seek, for very shame, to qualify and minimise this slander, without abjuring their error, are driven to hard straits. Surely it is nothing less than marvellous that certain devout men, defenders of the popular creed, should seek to bring God off, as it were, by a side wind, from all responsibility for the everlasting misery of His creatures. And this they attempt to do in connection with man's freedom of will, or else by supposing a Divine necessity for the existence of endless evil in the very nature of things, not directly due to God, but rather *over* God.

And yet, do but ask Christians what deepest cause they have to love God, and they will readily render this noble reply: "The Father sent His only Son to die for us upon the Cross, at we know not what amazing cost to His fatherly heart!" Yes, brethren, that is a proof of Divine love which there is no gainsaying; but it is not yet complete, it is not without a possible flaw. For the further question arises, What practical good was effected by that mighty death upon the Cross? If the answer is to run, that one soul here and there might be saved whilst millions should burn everlastingly, you will feel that fear rather than love is the chief disposition of the mind due to God. And if the gentler answer should be forthcoming, that millions might be saved whilst only one here and there should suffer an infinite punishment, you will still be apt to feel that fear rather than love is mainly due to such a terrible, such an inexorable Creator.* For, let a father be told that any *one*, the least, the last, the worst of his children is doomed, in consequence of his perverseness, to endless torture by the appointment of some undoubted benefactor of his race, through whom the rest of his children should be thrice blest, and then judge for yourselves whether fear or love towards that mighty benefactor would be the prevailing feeling in the father's heart? There is only one conceivable answer to this question, "What has God's Son done for mankind?" that can fully challenge love, and it is this: His death has compassed the ultimate salvation of the whole world. And that is the very answer Holy Scripture gives: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself"; and again, "For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved."

But those who willingly grant God's merciful design in form, deny it in fact and substance. Who so ready as the holders of dark doctrines to admit, nay to proclaim, as a matter of form, that Christ is "the Saviour of the world"; or again, that He is "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world"? But this blessed truth is precisely what is practically denied by the very men who do not scruple to take these words upon their lips.* When they speak these glorious words they mean nothing adequate, nothing satisfactory, by them. For the conditions of salvation are made so hard that, in very deed, Christ is only held in prevalent theology to be the Saviour of a favoured and elect few, instead of being set forth as the ultimate Saviour of all. And what is the result of this false and cruel teaching? The heartrending result is that love for God has been in large measure banished from earth, or at the least overlaid by a very mountain of fear and fearful apprehension.

Oh, the difference between the too common representation of God, and that which He truly is! It is the difference between the icy North Pole to which no man has yet attained, and the all fertilising central fire of love. For, mark this, brethren, if God be the universal Parent, then He must be everything that father and mother are to us, and more.† He must be loving, He must be indulgent, He must be anxious when we are in danger, He must be gladsome when we do well, He must be grieved to the heart if we forsake or neglect Him, wise in checking us for our faults, above all He must be remedial and correctional in His gravest punishments, ay, and most ready to forgive. And do any suppose that we can fathom even in thought the depth of His goodness?‡ God, I say, must be all this in the highest degree, or else—to speak it with reverence—His heart is not like the heart of earthly father and mother. And further, if God be indeed the universal Parent, then nothing less than our love can satisfy Him. For, take any good parents that you please; and do you suppose that their children's awe or fear or obedience prompted by terror can take for them the place of affection? True, not even the noblest parents can more than faintly represent to us the dignity of our heavenly Father. Our lowliest reverence and deepest adoration are His due. But my contention is that He will never be satisfied without our love.§ You that are

---

They may not think this out, but the notion would seem to be at the bottom of their minds. They believe in an inexorable fate, and assume that God has done all He could do in sending His only Son, and that He has exhausted His store of mercy. Augustine and Calvin were at the least logical, and saw that if an endless hell existed, God must be responsible for it.

* "If we grasp never so faintly the idea of what an *infinite* punishment means, it becomes clear that no proposition more revolting to the idea of justice can be stated, than this, that finite sins deserve an infinite penalty. Expand the first as you will, and it still falls infinitely short of infinity. Hence, it is but the sober statement of sober fact, to assert, that a single sentence of unending torment would outweigh the whole sins of the whole human race."—"Universalism Asserted," p. 38. By the Rev. Thomas Allin. Elliott Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

* "And yet, they tell us, this end is not gained after all, man is not saved, for countless myriads are in fact left to hopeless, endless misery; and that though for every one of these lost ones, so to speak, has been shed the life-blood of God's own Son."—*Ibid.*

† God the Universal Parent. Of all Mrs. Ewing's noble thoughts not one can be more beautiful or more just than this, which she has placed on the lips of the bereaved old school-master in "Jan of the Windmill:" "She died. I'd have gone mad but for the boy. All my thought was to make up her loss to him. A child learns a man to be unselfish, Jan. I used to think, God may well be the very fount of unselfish charity, when He has so many children, so helpless without Him"!

‡ "If God be not good, just and true, in the human acceptation of these terms, then the whole basis of revelation vanishes."—"Universalism Asserted," p. 16.

§ "If the thought that God is always with you, and that you may be pleasing Him even in your play, is not a bright and happy thought to you, that is simply because you do not know Him, and how good and kind He is. Are you ever sorry to see your father or your mother? If you meet them parents, conceive what your feelings would be if, when at any time you approached your children, they were to crouch in abject dread before you, instead of meeting you with smiles of love, or else in quiet trust and confidence. No matter how reverent and lowly and submissive the children were, could you be satisfied? Does a mother need, or does she not need her child's occasional—ay, and even repeated—assurance that it loves her? Tender endearments, whispered confidences—are not these things welcome to a parent's heart? If no kiss were forthcoming, but only timid glances such as deprecate wrath, would not you that are parents ask, "Why is my little one frightened?" And would it not be your earnest endeavour to lead the children to trust and love you instead of trembling in your presence? Well, dear brethren, like to that is the endeavour of the Holy Ghost the Comforter at this time, to remove the chilling belief, which has too long prevailed, in the merciless action, if not disposition, of the Creator towards countless millions of His creatures. How can we love a God, I must ask plainly, who gives consent to the everlasting burning of nine-tenths of our fellow-men? How can we look Him in the face and smile? How can we show Him the tokens of child-like affection? How can we do anything but cower away from His presence? And if we *do* love Him, believing that He is a Destroyer rather than a Deliverer, our love runs no small danger of being base, abject, devoted to one who does not seem to us really good, and therefore monstrous. What value do men set upon the love of cowards for their tyrant? Yes, conceivably, it may be a slur upon the devotion of certain saints that they love One who, according to their awful belief, was without a single beat of a father's heart, save for a favoured few. No doubt countless saints, who were "under the veil," did love the Triune God worthily; but it was only by rising above the gloomy tradition of their day that they could do this; it was only by entertaining a secret hope that God's mercy and compassion must be infinite that they could rightly love with heart and soul and mind the world's Creator. And yet, whilst I say this, let me admit freely that for simple folk who dwelt solely on the brighter side of revelation, without directing their attention to the everlastingly lost, love for God was very possible. Is it not so to this day? Only, the love of such persons was not and is not the noblest and the deepest, for they ever love God most worthily who recognise Him as Love.

Now let me ask, and it is a tremendous question, Do we love God? Speaking only to ourselves and to God in the recesses of our conscience, let us seek to answer this question one by one. Do I love God? Have I loved God or have I only feared Him from my childhood upward? And if I love Him, where are the tokens of my love? Do I take delight in prayer and praise? Have I, at any time, anything affectionate to say to Him, or are all my approaches to God cold and distant? Does it gladden me to give Him pleasure, does it grieve me to cause Him pain? Much will depend upon the teaching we received as little children. If our mothers were happily inspired to tell us of God's goodness, and inexhaustible patience, and sacred fatherly love, then it may have been possible and even easy for us to love Him. But if our mothers spoke to us chiefly of God's wrath and anger, everlasting anger against sinners, then, as I conceive, we have never loved but only feared Him. And the fault was not ours, no, nor yet that of our dear mothers, who, out of sheer love, spoke blighting and terrible words, but was due mainly to the evil tradition of Christendom.

Again I ask, Do we love God? I cannot go away yet from that tremendous question. Was there not a cloud at times over your innocent, bright and happy childhood? And was not that cloud the tradition of men as to the never-ending burning of the wicked in hell?* Surely, dear

---

in the street as you are coming home from school, do not your eyes brighten with pleasure? Do you not run to them? Do you not jump and dance about them, and chatter so fast that they can hardly make out what you say? If they come into the garden or the field where you are playing, do you run away and hide from them, except in fun? Are you not glad to see them? Can they please you better than by having a game with you? Is there anybody you like so well to play with or spend a holiday with? Well, but *God* loves you even better than they do. He is as much kinder than they are as He is wiser. Why, then, should you put away the thought of His presence from you? What should make you happier, if you are fairly good children, than to know that He is always with you, indoors and out of doors, when you walk and when you play?"—"The Bird's Nest, and other Sermons, for Children of all ages." By Rev. Samuel Cox, D.D., Author of "Salvator Mundi." J. Fisher Unwin, 26, Paternoster Square.

* Some of us elders are likely to remember Dr. Watts' hymns, which in childhood occupied right gloomily the place so lovingly filled by Mrs. Alexander's "Hymns for Little Children." Speaking out of my own experience, the danger of hell seemed a real one, and filled a larger space in my childish imagination than any thoughts of God's mercy. The extracts from popular preachers, given near the beginning of "Universalism Asserted," might be capped by recollections of my own. Let me, however, give a specimen of Mr. Allin's selection. No matter who was the preacher. Refer to his grand book for that, a strong book, where not a word is wasted, and in which the blows are those of a sledge-hammer. The dreadful thing is that a devout man thought to do God honour by such words as these:—"Little child, if you go to hell, there will be a devil at your side to strike you. He will go on striking you every minute for ever and ever, without stopping. The first stroke will make your body as bad as the body of Job, covered, from head to foot, with sores and ulcers. The second stroke will make your body twice as bad as the body of Job. The third stroke will make your body three times as bad as the body of Job. The fourth stroke, etc., etc., etc. How then will your body be after the devil has been striking it every moment for a hundred million years without stopping?"

What an infernal scoundrel, you would say, the man was who wrote that. But no! he was presumably a saintly man. That is not the whole of this particular extract, but it may suffice. A bad example, do you say? Yes, but brethren, in so far as we in our childhood believed in and realised the tradition of the elders—hell ever raging beneath our feet and swallowing up nine-tenths of the human race—our purest childish joys have not been quite unshadowed. And yet, God be praised, not any direst threats of future woe can avail to turn back the current of human joy. Though in the estimation of countless Christians that current empties itself nine times in ten into a bottomless pit of darkness, it flows joyfully still. So let me not question that very much of human happiness has fallen to your lot. The joy and gladness belonging by God's appointment to early life are not to be crushed, when every birthday is an assurance of our Maker's goodness, when every flower is a source of delight, when a mother's kisses are sacred and all-sufficing. Joyous companionship in sports, kindly encouragement in studies—those studies themselves opening out vistas of knowledge—the red blood bounding through our veins, the rising tide of life and hope and joy; all these things tend by heaven's design to gladness. God the All-giver be praised for them! But for all that, and though it may have been no bigger than a man's hand, was not the cloud existent? *And did it not come between you and God?* Do you ask, how so? Follow me for a moment, and you shall see. You that are parents, are you not frequently and painfully struck by the lack of devotion which you witness in your children, no doubt more in some than in others? The little ones, so affectionate to you, will they not hurry over their short prayers in weariness of spirit? The older children, when otherwise you have no fault to find with them, are they not apt to show a carelessness and irreverence in matters of religion which cannot but distress you? And do you believe this is according to a law of nature, and cannot be altered until, perhaps late in life, the hour of their conversion strikes? Nay, for they ought to love God now. These children, these young people, do you suppose they understand that God is good? How should they understand it so long as they are told that sinners shall burn in everlasting flames? Here it is, just here, that the children are repelled and estranged from God; for they can only love when they know that they are loved. If the children are to love God, then you that are parents should dwell fondly and truly in their hearing on divine love and goodness. You should tell them that the Almighty Father will love them to the end, and will ultimately reclaim every human soul, the last and worst. You should tell them, in a word, that God is Love. But when and where, in the popular religion, is our heavenly Father represented as good and kind and loving? Earthly parents we know to be parents indeed, and to them we owe a deathless debt of gratitude; but unless I err, there is too commonly little thought of comfort in our heavenly Father. Too possibly we can only lean to the hope that our Saviour may shield us from the Father's dreadful wrath. O basest of calumnies! but it has long prevailed; and the tradition as to everlasting burning has turned for countless Christians what should have been love into fear, and consequent estrangement.

What a wrong was done to us and to God when our young hearts were stolen from Him, say rather when our hearts were chilled and silenced, and a measured faith and awe took in us the place of love. And we have perhaps grown up in such a temper of mind as this, making no confidences to our heavenly Father, in nothing leaning upon His love, treating God as an austere Master? That is only too possible. St. Paul asks very nobly, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" and presently the Apostle adds, "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature (*or* creation), shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans viii.). Alas, brethren, the Apostle's generous persuasion fails to make allowance for the uprising of a deadly error contrary to the tenor of all his teaching, a very wall of partition between God and man; fails to make allowance for the power of a calumny which sets a vengeful Deity upon the throne of heaven, to the weakening, nay, to the dissolution of love; fails to make allowance for the emptying of all grace and comfort out of those words of tenderness, "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus."

But some may and will object: This is sheer hardihood, this is too daring—to seek to love the Father! Be content, be satisfied, to love all that is according to the mind of God. Anything more than that is of the nature of presumption. Is the Father such an one as thyself? Is He like to man that thou shouldest aspire to love Him? Is He not awful, eternal, mysterious, incomprehen-

---

after all, as milk and water is to vitriol, compared with the boundless brutality thoughtlessly imputed throughout eternity to the Almighty Father. Who that has any bowels does not feel the Christian relief which is afforded when Christians make sport of these devilries? Such a Christian is Thackeray. In what follows, the soul of Sir Roger de Rollo is the speaker, condemned for ever, and all for want of a single *ave.*

"Nevertheless, sinner as I am, one more ave would have saved me; for my sister, who was abbess of St. Mary of Cauchigny, did so prevail by her prayer and good works for my lost and wretched soul, that every day I felt the pains of purgatory decrease; the pitchforks which, on my first entry, had never ceased to vex and torment my poor carcase, were now not applied above once a week; the roasting had ceased, the boiling had discontinued; only a certain warmth was kept up to remind me of my situation."—Thackeray's "Paris Sketch Book:" "The Devil's Wager."

This being the sermon of the series which is most concerned with children, in order to afford to these a little innocent pleasure, I refer them and children of a larger growth to the Discourse of Monsieur le Curé. Vide Appendix to this sermon. It is left in French of the easiest decription. A translation might too easily spoil it.

sible? Is not the mere thought of His majesty overwhelming? And art thou not ready to sink abashed before His presence? Call to mind thy sins, and be ashamed. Remember God's just wrath, and be afeared. Wilt thou not, with Job, "abhor thyself, and repent in dust and ashes"? Do our hearts misgive us, belovëd? Do they sink within us at these stern remonstrances? Alas, the old blind terrors which have long beset us are but momentarily hushed, not dead and buried, and may be quickly conjured back. What we need, what we greatly need, is encouragement. Where shall we find it? Scarcely in man. So then in God! in the command of the text, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart"; in the mighty revelation, "God is love"; and again in those words of singular endearment, "Our Father." And if indeed we should venture to conceive that God is like man, only infinitely nobler, wiser, and more lovable, how should we greatly err,—for, was not man created in the image of God? And who is it that has declared or set forth to us the Father and all His goodness, even saying "The Father Himself loveth you"? None other than the only-begotten Son, who was also the Son of Man. So, then, not any grave reproaches, no sternest reminders of our nothingness, should daunt us, as though to love the Father were over-bold and familiar.* The Father loves us, and desires of all things our love. And the Son commands it. And no mere empty phrases, such as that it should suffice us to love all that is "according to the mind of God," can still the hunger of grateful souls. What we may actually do is one thing, coldhearted that we are, but what we ought to do is nothing short of this: we should fall before the Father's footstool with deep reverence, with yet deeper love, and at the least we should aspire to say, "Thou art good, and gentle, and fatherly; in mercy Thou hast created all men; in love unutterable Thou gavest consent to the death of Thine only Son for the world's salvation; Thou hast granted me much happiness here, and the hope of heaven hereafter; even in Thy wrath Thou thinkest upon mercy; and I, Thy unworthy child, adore and love Thee."† And if you went on with childlike babble, to repeat again and again, "Thou art so good, and so gracious, and so loving, and so fatherly, that we can never love Thee enough"—you would only be making, as it were, a feeble and lawful variation upon the Church's "Gloria in Excelsis," wherein we sing, "We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty." Or may we not say with the Psalmist, "Whom have I in heaven but Thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison of Thee."

O happy young people, who hear a more loving teaching concerning the God of love than fell, it is like, to our lot who are no longer young! And yet there is little need for us elders to envy you, for we, whom the Holy Spirit is even now leading out of darkness into light, more than share your gladness. And our souls look forward to a time, as we trust no longer distant, when the Holy Spirit shall convince the world more and more that God is love. Not until our noblest theologians and teachers shall have spoken out, as with one voice, can we hope fully to realise that God is love indeed. And some of us may not live to see that blessed day. Yet there remains a consolation for those who are nearest to the hour of their departure, and it is this: Doubt, gloom, and terror—in a word, the evil old tradition—cannot pursue us into the unseen place. There, in Hades, be our chastisement what it may (and we may find full peace with God here "through the blood of the everlasting covenant"), God's love will be fully revealed to us; and, at the worst, from the midst of the very fires, we shall be ready to exclaim, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."* But we trust that even now a better time is at hand. Then shall the hearts and souls and minds of Christians be devoted to God in love. Then shall God receive a free and affectionate, a reverent and a trustful service, such as He longs for now for the more part in vain. Then shall smiling and obedient children delight their Heavenly Father's heart with their caresses, with their simple and engaging confidence and boundless trust. Then at last shall perfect love cast out fear. And as after death we are permitted to enter, first Paradise, and then Heaven itself, the central joy of Heaven, to become ours in ever-increasing measure, shall be, shall surely be, to love God with all our heart and mind and soul and strength for ever and for ever more.

---

* Victor Hugo's daring expressions, never intentionally impious, regarding the Almighty, in his beautiful "L'Art d'être Grand Père," are infinitely preferable to the icy-cold and formal approaches to the Father of all of not a few excellent Christians. I allude more especially to the poet's definition of Deity, so affectionate, if you take it rightly, and full of measureless sweetness, "Le vieux grand-père à tous."

† In the Lord's Prayer, the Psalms, the Apocalypse, the Prayer-book of the Church of England, grateful and filial forms of devotion are supplied to us. Let but the cloud be taken away which hides from us our Father's face, and even without words our hearts will sing and give praise. How slight need be the words when the spirit is ready. Why should these two lines of Robert Browning remain only a poet's dream?

Morning, evening, noon, and night,
Praise God, sang Theocrite."

* I fully admit that it is possible, ay, and our bounden duty, to seek and to find full peace with God here; so that for some, and I hope for many of us, it will be far better to depart and be at once with Christ. I know that "the souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, and there shall no torment touch them."

APPENDIX.

LE DISCOURS DE MONSIEUR LE CURÉ.

MESSIEURS ET MESDAMES,

Je viens de faire un mauvais rêve, et je m'en vais vous raconter cela. Je me croyais à la porte du Paradis. Voilà Monseigneur Saint Pierre lui-même qui vient à ma rencontre: "Monsieur," me dit-il, "entrez; sans doute que votre passeport est en règle." "Pardon, Monsieur l'archi-apôtre," lui répondis-je, "il ne s'agit pas de cela. Je ne souhaite que de savoir s'il y a de mes paroissiens par ici?" "Mais, Monsieur, de quelle paroisse que vous êtes?" "Monsieur l'archi-apôtre, je suis le Curé de Coquignon." "N'ayez pas peur, Monsieur le Curé, cela se trouvera. Qu'on m'apporte le registre! De quelle paroisse que vous dites?" "Coq-uign-on." "Voyons, Coq, Coq, Coq, Coq, Coq. Non, Monsieur, ça n'y est pas. Sans doute il faudra que vous vous adressiez *en haut*." Eh bien, Messieurs et Mesdames, je suis monté à la porte céleste. Voilà Monsieur l'Archange Gabriel lui-même, qui vient à ma rencontre: "Monsieur," me dit-il, "soyez le bienvenu, donnez-vous la peine d'entrer." "Pardon, Monsieur l'Archange," lui répondis-je, "il ne s'agit pas de cela. Je ne voudrais que m'informer s'il y a de mes paroissiens par ici?" "Mais, Monsieur, de quelle paroisse que vous êtes?" "Monsieur l'Archange, je suis le pauvre Curé de Coquignon." "Ah! par exemple, Monsieur le Curé, en doutez vous? Qu'on m'apporte le registre! De quelle paroisse que vous dites?" "Coq-uign-on." "Voyons, Coq, Coq, Coq, Coq, Coq. Non, Monsieur le Curé, cela ne s'y trouve pas. Mais, allons, vous n'avez qu'à vous adresser au Paradis." "Hélas, Monsieur l'Archange, j'y suis déjà été." "Alors, Monsieur, il faudra que vous vous adressiez *en bas!*" Eh bien, Messieurs et Mesdames, je suis descendu à la porte de l'enfer. Voilà Monsieur Satan lui-même, qui vient à ma rencontre. "Entrez! entrez!" me cria-t-il. "Tout doucement, Monsieur Satan," lui répondis-je, "il ne s'agit pas de cela." "Mais entrez toujours, entrez tout de même, ne vous gênez pas." "Nenni, Monsieur Satan, ce n'est pas mon affaire. Je viens tout bonnement savoir s'il y a de mes paroissiens par ici?" "Mais, de quelle paroisse que vous êtes, imbécile?" "Monsieur Satan, je suis le Curé de Coquignon." "Coquignon! Coquignon! vous dites? Coquignon!! Ha! ha! ha! ha! ha! Mais oui, par-ci, par-là, partout."

Mes frères, mes sœurs, faites votre salut!

◆

THE Bishop of Sodor and Man has appointed as his chaplains Canon C. W. Bardsley, Vicar of Ulverston, formerly Curate of St. Ann's, Manchester; the Rev. J. W. Bardsley, Vicar of Huddersfield; the Rev. Hugh Stowell Gill, Vicar of Kirk Malew, Isle of Man; and Archdeacon Hughes-Games, Rector of Kirk Andreas, Isle of Man.

CHRIST THE BREAD OF LIFE.

BY THE REV. H. HEBER EVANS, B.A.,
LATE VICAR OF MAPPERLEY.

A HARVEST THANKSGIVING SERMON, PREACHED AT ALL SAINTS' CHURCH, KIRK HALLAM, DERBY.

"Jesus said unto them, I am the Bread of Life: he that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst."—ST. JOHN vi. 35.

OF all the various kinds of food with which our good and wise Creator has furnished the globe on which He has placed us, there is one which is so pre-eminently nutritious and adapted to sustain us, that we call it the "staff of life." It is that which of all others is needed to support the life of the body. Hence it stands for and includes all kinds of food, bodily and spiritual, in the pattern prayer taught us by our Blessed Lord, "Give us this day our daily bread."

We are met to-day to render thanks and to give praise to God for His gracious gift of the harvest. We are not threatened with that scourge of famine which, not many years ago, carried off with untold suffering one million of our fellow-subjects in India, and countless numbers of our fellow-creatures in China, who, with their little ones, suffered all the horrors of actual starvation. We may well be thankful that we have been spared such a visitation, for, judged by our light and privileges, when we think of the iniquity which abounds in our land—the open drunkenness and the unchecked licentiousness—perhaps we scarcely deserve more from our Maker than the untaught heathen. We have been spared so great a calamity—but is starvation quite unknown in our own country—great and prosperous, as it is often called?

No, for every year in the capital of Christian England—in London, the very centre of civilisation and culture, with all its wealth, and luxury, and splendour—and with its nineteenth-century Christianity, too; with its thousand churches, and its tens of thousands of professing Christians—at least *fifty* human beings, made like ourselves, die every year of sheer starvation.

But we will no longer mar with such sad thoughts the joyful gladness of this Thanksgiving Service for the harvest. We will rather thank God for His kindness in supplying our wants. We shall, perhaps, learn not to waste God's good gifts, but "to use them without abusing them," "that we may have to give to them that need."

Let us thank our Maker for His bounty in providing for the wants of those bodies, which are so "fearfully and wonderfully made."

Let us thank Him for His abundant goodness in bestowing on us the kindly fruits of the earth, and in refreshing our eyes, too often worn and wearied by all the sinful and saddening scenes of life, with the ever-fresh loveliness of the flowers—

those flowers which in their simple grace and matchless beauty surpass the splendour even of "King Solomon in all his glory."

We, as the creatures of God's hand, are quite dependent upon His loving kindness. It is God Who, as St. Paul reminds us, "giveth us life, and breath, and all things." "In Him we live and move and have our being." Without God we cannot draw one breath, or take a single step. And it is God who gives us our daily bread. Were He to forget us for one instant how could we continue to exist—who would supply our countless wants which press on us every moment? But God does not forget us, His needy creatures—"not a sparrow falls on the ground without our Father," and "even the very hairs of our head are all numbered." And this, God's gift of another harvest, is a fresh proof of our Maker's kind providence and thoughtful love.

We, as intelligent creatures of the Living God, are bound to thank Him for His goodness in "giving food to all flesh," and for sustaining His living Creation by His almighty power.

We, through God's great gift of reason, can enter somewhat into the marvellous thoughts—can understand something of the wonderful works of the Creator. We are bound to "give Him the honour due unto His Name."

More than this, we can be and we are "fellow-labourers with God." It is God Almighty alone who created the corn; it is "God alone who gives the thirty-fold, or the sixty-fold increase"; but is it not man's labour that ploughs up the fallow ground, that sows the tiny living seed, that afterwards reaps the abundant harvest of golden grain, and safely stores it in the garner for "the bread which is to strengthen man's heart?" But all this a thoughtful heathen might do. A heathen who had never heard the blessed message of the Gospel might well thank the invisible God for His bounty and His care. For what have we, baptised Christians, more than others, to thank God? Is it not for this that "our Father giveth us the true bread from Heaven"? What bread is that, do you ask? My text will answer you: "Jesus said, I am the Bread of Life. For the Bread of God is He who cometh down from Heaven, and giveth life unto the world. This is the bread that a man may eat thereof and not die."

Have not we Christians to thank God that He, in His great mercy, has given His Son to be the Saviour we all need—to "put away all our sin by the sacrifice of Himself" on the Cross—to be our Perfect Example—and to be the very Bread of Life by which our fainting souls are to be fed? How would abundant harvests be a blessing to us, if this passing world were all, if we had to live and to die without God revealed in Christ, and without any hope of Heaven? What would all the fruits and flowers of earth be to us, if we were doomed to remain, through life, the hopeless and degraded slaves of sin—the helpless victims of our own evil passions and corrupt nature? What sort of an existence would this be, if the bright hope of a better life never cheered its solitude, its sorrows, and its trials—never shone on the dark and awful mystery of death—never lighted up the long sad gloom of the grave? To what purpose should we nourish and strengthen, with the varied fruits of the earth, a body which is foredoomed after a few quickly-flying years of troubled existence, to be mingled with that earth from which its original elements were taken, had we not a better hope than that of the Atheist and of the Materialist—"the sure and certain hope of a joyful Resurrection unto Eternal Life"?

And to whom do we owe this gladdening hope, this "anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast"? Do we not owe it to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, "Who endured the Cross, despising the shame"; "Who loved us and gave Himself for us"? Do we not owe it to our blessed Lord, who, by "laying down His life for us, His lost sheep," "abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." As St. John teaches us, "the gift of God is eternal life, and this life is in His Son"; and again, "he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

"Man doth not live by bread alone." We have, as those "made in the image of God," a deeper-seated and more imperious hunger than that of the body. Our never-dying souls have need of heavenly, of spiritual food. Riches will not satisfy our immortal spirit. Pleasure will not quench its deathless longing. Fame gives but a stone to stop the hunger that cries for bread. Our living souls, they need the Bread of Life. And that is just what, in the blessed everlasting Gospel, our Heavenly Father offers to each one of us, however sinful we may be. God offers to each one of us the Bread of Life. He freely gives us His Son Jesus Christ to be our Saviour, that out of the fulness of "His unsearchable riches," He may supply all our need. He has given us the greatest gift He could give us, more than we lost sinners dare ask or hope for, but not more than every one of us really needs.

By God's eternal purpose and unchanging decree, Jesus Christ is to be, and to those who by simple faith receive Him into their hearts, Jesus Christ is, the ever-flowing Fountain of Living Water, which alone can satisfy the thirst of the soul. Christ, and Christ alone, is the wonderful channel of all the blessings which our Heavenly Father showers on us, His too often unworthy and ungrateful children. Christ is appointed to be "a Prince and a Saviour;" "He is given to be Head over all things to the Church;" "in Him dwells all the fulness of the God-head bodily." The one appointed Mediator between the true and living God and all the countless myriads of mankind is "the Man Christ Jesus." "Behold the Man!"

If we have Christ, we have all that our souls need—pardon and peace, life and love, spiritual health and happiness. Without Christ, though we may think ourselves rich, we are really only poor, and blind, and needy. Have we ever thanked our Maker for His great gift of a Saviour, "to save sinners," "to save us from our sins"—the greatest of all His great and numberless gifts to His creatures? Have we shown our gratitude by giving up our sins, and by following this Saviour as His true disciples?

Bread will not strengthen us unless we eat it; medicine cannot cure us unless we take it. What can Christ do for us unless we believe on Him, and obey Him? We must stretch forth the hand of faith to take God's free gift of the Bread of Life. We must feed on Christ spiritually in our heart. If we come to Him with simple child-like faith—that is, keep His words, do His will, follow His example, live as His real disciples, as true Christians—He will nourish us with Himself the Bread of Life, and, according to His own most true promise, we shall never hunger; we shall never want anything else, for we can have nothing better. Our souls will grow, grow in grace and in the knowledge and love of our Saviour; they will grow like Him, in true holiness, in courage and patience, in meekness and manliness, in unselfishness and love, and, by the Holy Spirit's help, we shall be more and more prepared to live with Him for ever.

If only we are "His own sheep" He will "give unto us eternal life, and we shall never perish, nor shall any be able to pluck us out of His hand." With His own protecting arm of love around us, we need not fear even the dark valley of the shadow of death, nor all the power of the King of Terrors.

Then is Christ to me the Bread of Life? Do I feed on Him, do I grow by feeding on "this Living Bread which came down from Heaven to give life unto the world."

We are shocked at those who waste the earthly food that perisheth, who tread beneath their feet that bread which is the staff of life, and for which so many famished fellow-creatures would be truly grateful. What shall we say of those who, by their wilful sin or their careless neglect, "trample under foot the Son of God," the very Bread of Life, who came to save sinners and to give life to this dying world?

Let it not be so with any of us. While we gratefully thank and praise God for His bounteous gift of the harvest, and for all the blessings of this life, let us not forget to praise Him "above all for His inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ." Let us never forget, but treasure up in our hearts, and act on in our lives, our Blessed Saviour's precious words of promise: "I am the Bread of Life: he that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst."

RHEUMATISM, GOUT,
SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, INDIGESTION, CONSTIPATION, LIVER & KIDNEY COMPLAINTS, NERVOUS DISORDERS, LADIES' AILMENTS, ETC. Promptly Relieved and CURED BY
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
ALL sufferers should read "Harness' Guide to Health," free by post, containing copies of **Thousands of Testimonials.** Every man and woman in search of **Health, Strength, and Energy,** should at once send a **21s.** postal order to the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd. 52, OXFORD ST.** LONDON, W. and procure one of these famous Belts, and they may rely upon being **CURED**
Corner of Rathbone Place.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1887.

THE BODY A VEHICLE OF SALVATION.

We trust that the original and able sermon by the Bishop of Meath, on "The Body an Evidence of Christianity," which appeared in our issue of the 13th ultimo, will have attracted the attention and thoughtful consideration of our readers. The accomplished Bishop is, we believe, absolutely right when he says that "Christianity tells us that it is to the perfecting and the exalting of our bodily frame that we must look for our ultimate happiness, anticipating by the actual fact of Christ's resurrection, and the doctrine based upon it, the tendency of modern physiological researches." And that "recent investigations by physiologists really accord with the doctrines of the Gospel far better than all the systems of those metaphysicians who, whether defending or assailing Christianity, have equally mistaken its nature and perverted its message." We feel that it is by following the example and teaching of Moses and Christ, who were sanitary before they were moral reformers, that our moral teachers will best succeed in improving the habits and regulating the passions of men, and consequently in advancing the happiness of mankind here and hereafter. It is certain that the morals of men in the present life are largely dependent on the state of their bodily health. This is a powerful reason why clergy as well as laity should use diligently every means that Christ and Moses, as well as modern science, have placed in our hands for perfecting and exalting the human frame. With the exception of our school-masters, we fear that there are not many of the clergy of the Establishment who show much zeal in the matter of sanitary reform, which St. Paul would certainly have denominated "love which edifieth;" whereas the clergy of the Dissenting communions actually pass resolutions in their Congregational Union that hereditary disease of the most crippling and degenerating character ought *not* to be either prevented or cured, thereby disobeying the express command of their Lord and Master, to "Heal the sick, to cleanse the lepers, to save the people from their sins." The representative of these misleading teachers of the people actually maintained in the House of Commons that health and purity of blood did not conduce to morality; a proposition which we venture to think is directly at variance with the truth. Certainly, according to our experience, Jews and Mahommedans, who personally are stronger and more healthy than Christians, because they make the health of the body as well as that of the soul an object of their religion, are more generally moral than Christians, whether Roman, Greek, or Protestant, *i.e.*, they are far more obedient to the Ten Commandments. It is, however, possible that their superior morality may be in part due to their more earnest and more elaborate religious instruction, and not wholly to their superior bodily health. Every man of any experience must admit that the mind and body act and re-act upon each other. The brain is the organ of the mind and soul of man, and there must of necessity be a more or less intimate relation between an organ and its functions. It would appear, therefore, that the salvation of the body and the soul ought to be inseparably connected, and this they are, according to the Bishop of Meath, in the Christian religion as preached in Apostolic times, and as defined in the creeds of the Catholic Church. It is to our own great spiritual and physical detriment that they were ever separated, and it is to be hoped that the time is not far distant when this unscriptural divorce will be terminated, and that the regeneration of the human race will be pushed forward in leaps and bounds by our moral teachers. It will be of happy omen if several of the clergy follow in the footsteps of the Bishop of Meath, and inculcate the great religious duty of securing and preserving the purity and holiness of the human body and blood through successive generations. We can promise that their labours in this direction will be abundantly blessed, and that they will reap an abundant harvest, not only in the prevention of a legion of degenerative diseases, which at present afflict, blight, and destroy their people, but also in improving the moral tone, and preventing the sins and crimes of their parishioners. In not a few churches we believe that it will be thought to be a novelty thus to exhibit Christianity as the great reforming as well as conserving force in human life, and as practically inculcating truly progressive civilization.

◆

AT present there are only some twenty-six places from which the see of a Bishop Suffragan may be selected. In a Bill that has been read a second time in the House of Commons, it is proposed to extend the choice to all boroughs or divisions of boroughs that return a member to Parliament. The preamble states that, owing to the increase of populations, the towns set forth in the old Act of King Henry VIII. are now frequently unsuitable to be named for the sees of Bishops Suffragans in many of the dioceses. These towns are:—Thetford, Ipswich, Colchester, Dover, Guildford, Southampton, Taunton, Shaftesbury, Molton, Marlborough, Bedford, Leicester, Gloucester, Shrewsbury, Bristol, Penrith, Bridgwater, Nottingham, Grantham, Hull, Huntingdon, Cambridge, Perth, Berwick, and St. Germains. To these was added the Isle of Wight.

◆

IN MEMORIAM—WALTER DAVIES WILLIAMS, M.D.

FOLLOWING closely on the death of Mr. Charles Jacomb, a short memoir of whom was inserted in a recent issue of our journal, it is now our melancholy duty to record the decease of Dr. Williams, for many years proprietor and medical superintendent of Pembroke House Lunatic Asylum, London Fields, Hackney. He, like the philanthropist who was called away but one short week previously, was ardently attached to the church of his fathers, to the lengthening of whose cords, and strengthening of whose stakes, the greater part of his long and useful life was devoted. Although engaged in the pursuit of an arduous profession and holding a position of more than ordinary responsibility, he nevertheless found time and opportunity to put into a practical shape projects dear to his heart, the accomplishment of which involved much thought, considerable tact, and no small degree of self-denial.

Stimulated by the example set by the Bishop of London's Fund, and with a view to overtake the rapid growth of population, Dr. Williams took an accurate survey of South Hackney where he then resided, and finding that there was but one church for some 40,000 inhabitants at once applied himself to the work of church extension.

Accordingly, in 1863, he presented the site on which the church of St. Michael and All Angels, London Fields, at present stands, and in addition contributed largely to its erection. In 1867 he promoted the building of St. Augustine's, Victoria Park, to the funds of which he was a generous donor.

In 1870 he devised a scheme for the completion of the last of the circle, Christ Church, South Hackney, subscribing a large sum to its erection, and rallying around him a host of personal influential friends, who nobly seconded his efforts, and lastly in 1872, he took an active part in the erection of St. Luke's, Chatham Place, the building fund of which was materially augmented by his munificence.

Upon the construction of the Great Eastern Railway, Dr. Williams' house and grounds were acquired by the company in connection with the Compulsory Act. His establishment was transferred to Ealing and placed under the superintendence of his former able and much respected assistant, Dr. Christie, and he himself took up his residence at Reigate, where he cultivated the friendship of Canon Cazenove, in whose spiritual labours he evinced the same amount of interest as in his Hackney days.

The last few years of his life was spent with his family at Eastbourne, where the same desire for church extension was displayed, and two of the more modern churches bear testimony to the cause which he so warmly espoused. Diffident almost to shyness in manner, retiring and unobtrusive in disposition, of a gentlemanly and courteous nature, and gifted with far-seeing and business-like habits, Dr. Williams prosecuted his labours of love quietly and unostentatiously, satisfied with the conviction that he was instrumental in the extension of Christ's kingdom on earth and in the promotion of the honour and glory of the Master whom he so humbly and faithfully served. "Like as a shock of corn cometh in his season," he came to his grave "in a full age," having attained his 80th year, and all that was mortal of him was laid in Ocklynne Cemetery, where he "rests from his labours, and his works do follow him."—J. C. EGAN.

◆

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND'S CATECHISM.

SIR,—I have to request that such persons as may be interested in the following shall read it in connection with the letter of "Even-handed Justice" in today's CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT.

Your correspondent says that the preface of the Church of Ireland Common Prayer Book contains an absolute falsehood. This falsehood is contained in the words—"in this behalf we have made no other change than to add to the Catechism one question, with an answer taken out of the twenty-eighth of the said Articles."

The new question and answer come after the answer, "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." They are:—Question. After what manner are the Body and Blood of Christ taken and received in the Lord's Supper? Answer. Only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby they are taken and received is faith.

Your correspondent says that this question and answer are taken, not from the twenty-eighth article only, but from that article and the Catechism itself; and that their language is adopted not from the article, as pretended, but from the Catechism. He bases this statement, which is not easy to understand, the matter of it not being on the surface, on the construction that he places on the wording of the question and answer. He says that the clause of the article—"The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," is not adopted in the new question and answer; and that the use of the words "taken and received" is adopted from the preceding answer in the Catechism. He does not take notice of the fact that the new answer is taken from the article, with only the variation between "taken and received" and "received and eaten." He does not notice that it is necessary, if the Catechism be a thing preserving a sequence in order of thought, that the new question should arise from the preceding answer, in which the words are "taken and received;" which words are kept in use in the new question and answer. He says that this "was done for a purpose, exclusion of priest and bread;" forgetting that neither the word "priest" nor the word "bread" is to be found in the clause of the article which is adopted in the amended Catechism, and that therefore they cannot be excluded. He mixes up all this curious criticism with what are a good deal more than insinuations against the honesty of the authors of the preface; and he makes a reference to the Revision Committee's report, attributing to the preface language and meaning which the report contains, but the preface does not.

According to all this, your correspondent says that it is an absolute falsehood to say in the preface that the new answer in our Catechism is taken out of the twenty-eighth article. The new question is not so taken, and the preface does not say that it is so taken. The new question is taken, as I observe above, from the antecedent answer, as it ought to be. These things being so, to make this accusation of absolute falsehood is a piece of impudence. So unfounded, nay, so directly in the face of the fact, is the accusation, that the only excuse for the impudence that I can conjecture is that your correspondent is incapable of understanding the meanings of words and the construction of sentences.

As for the threat to establish a new dissenting sect in a country where there are too many dissenting sects, the Church of Ireland has many enemies, whom it may not affect to disregard, but I think it may disregard without any affectation the imputations on the characters of its chiefest men by a person who cannot give the merest whiff of plausibility to slander.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

Armagh, Ireland, 20th August, 1887.

◆

THE MINOR INCUMBENTS OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

SIR,—Will you allow me to bring under the notice of your many influential English Church readers a matter which, long ere this, ought to have had the prompt consideration of our Queen and Government in this Protestant realm of England. Since Disestablishment and Disendowment, it is a crying shame to see the minor incumbents of the Church of Ireland in sole charge of country parishes, and therein labouring on for years, some of them single men with many and pressing claims upon them, and no private means; others married men with large families to be educated and otherwise provided for. The generosity of a purse-proud, but grinding lay element, would only give these faithful workers a beggarly £200 a year, in some cases subject to deductions. I ask, is this just in the sight of God? Has not many a valet or steward better salary than this? Surely the cries of those who have reaped are entering into the ears of the Lord God of Sabbaoth! I have no hesitation in saying the iniquitous Act of 1869 robbed the Church of the Living God.

But in the name of both religion and common sense I ask—are these long-tried and long-neglected men still to be left out in the cold, even in this Jubilee year, uncared for and unthought of? Is not such cruel indifference enough to throw a damper over all their energies, notwithstanding their great faith, patience, and perseverance? Will not England's great and wealthy ones have sympathy for the suffering ones in the sister isle? Will the Church of England make no stir towards seeing their brethren in the Church of

Ireland placed on a better footing? "Let brotherly love continue" is a divine command. Surely any clergyman in sole charge of a parish, without a curate, doing all the duty himself, ought to have secured to him at least £400 per annum.

The treatment of the laity for their clergy, and the ungenerous way in which they have treated their clergy since 1869, the Lord has seen and recorded, and the result,—a just God has begun His humbling work on the rich, but in many cases Godless, landlords of Ireland through the channel of the Land League. Christianity does not wish evil to any man, even its persecutors, yet it cannot but see the judgment, having its eyes wide open. Are not the labourers worthy of their hire? Think you not the cries of those who have reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of the Vineyard? And shall not God avenge His own elect?

There is Jubilee for the Army, the Navy, the Police. Will England scorn the idea of a Jubilee for the hard-worked but patient clergy?

AN INDIGNANT LOOKER-ON.

◆

THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—With respect to your review of Canon Crosthwaite's pamphlet entitled, "A Modest Inquiry as to Certain Difficulties Connected with the Mysterious Presence in the Holy Eucharist," I take the liberty of correcting you on a certain point. "The party of re-action (as you call us) do (*not*) want to force our theories upon any Church" or any individual. As I have single-handed championed the Catholic truth of the "real spiritual objective Presence" against the numerous impugners of this doctrine during months of controversy carried on in the *Dublin Evening Mail*, I am certainly entitled to be heard on the present occasion. Canon Crosthwaite says, in page 10: "The Body of Christ, in some sense, *given to us with the bread*," etc. We claim no more than that. Whereas our other opponents contradicted these words with the greatest virulence, and the Canon allowed them any amount of latitude. I have no experience of Catholics having "forced into the Irish revised Prayer-book methods of rationalistic Church defence," and would feel obliged by either you or the Canon pointing out these methods.

The Canon, I have no doubt unintentionally, has raised a false issue, viz., that I appealed to the Privy Council judgment, which he quotes to prove that "adoration did not contravene the law of the Church." This is the wording of the judgment of the Court of Arches, whose decision we recognise in preference to that of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Canon, in a letter to the *Dublin Evening Mail*, remarks that he laid no stress upon the judgment of a Court which "condoned inspiration, a personal devil, future punishment, and baptismal grace," meaning the Privy Council. I only quoted the judgment of the Privy Council to show that even such a Court, *objected to by the Canon*, was forced to acquit Mr. Bennett. I wrote in the secular paper over the signature of "Irish Churchman." I now sign my real name, and challenge contradiction to my statement.

SOPHIA J. MARSHALL.

Baronne Court, Parsonstown, Ireland.

[We are sure that our reviewer did not intend to use the word "force," as applied to theories concerning spiritual things, in any unfair or offensive sense. We should be the last to spoil honest religious work, or to stifle religious enthusiasm. Our vocation is to test them, and see whether they be according to the knowledge vouchsafed to us. On this question we regard the flesh and blood of Christ as a most apt and beautiful Oriental allegory of His Divine teaching, character, and influence; an allegory which was explained, though not so fully as it might have been, by Canon Rawstorne in a sermon which we printed about two years since.—ED.]

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." September, 1887. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

PROFESSOR DAVIDSON contributes a second paper on the Prophet Amos; Dr. Maclaren another paper on the Epistle to Philemon; the Dean of Armagh one called "Asking in Christ's Name." Of all these we can say that they are thoroughly good, but call for no special remarks.

Mr. Page's "Problem in Criticism" puzzles us. His "criticism" is on Mark xiii. 14, and the parallel passages, and therein especially on the words, "Let him that readeth understand"; and his conclusion, if we rightly understand him, is "that Mark and Matthew both employed a common document." It is quite possible that they did, though the ordinary arguments have not convinced us yet, but we certainly fail to see how the insertion of this parenthesis bears more than very slightly, even if so much, on the question.

Mr. Simcox has a long paper on "The Origin of the Christian Ministry"—a subject very fertile of theories. He has a theory that "every presbyter at Corinth had a vested right to succeed to the bishopric in his turn, or that," etc. Now when Clement wrote his Epistle (and Mr. Simcox gets his theory therefrom) the Church of Corinth had hardly been long enough in existence for "vested interests" of such a nature as this to arise. A wild theory this, we think; and we confess that we are a little tired of these papers, which put forth theories, but settle nothing, and from the nature of the case cannot settle anything.

Principal Brown's "Personal Reminiscences of Edward Irving" are very interesting. On the authority of Mr. Basil Montague he says: "At ten o'clock he [Irving] retired to his study, and was no more to be seen till after his dinner hour, or about three o'clock." No wonder he was a great preacher! No wonder Nonconformists can preach. They have no parishes. They call "the righteous," who come to chapel, most eloquently; but who would look up "the sinners," who go nowhere, if it were not for the parochial system of the Church of England?

◆

ALTHOUGH the committee of the Church House has not met this month, some meetings have been held in connection with the fund within the last fortnight in Norfolk and in Kent, and the work is evidently progressing. Upwards of £45,000 has been promised. The colonial diocesan contributions have begun by the payment of £50 to the fund by the Bishop of Wellington collected in his diocese. The site and trust deed will probably be made known in October.

Truth says :—" Some months ago the parish church of St. Giles's, Camberwell, was restored, and a buttress standing at the western corner was ornamented with five gargoyles. These figure-heads represent five statesmen : Lord Salisbury, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Chamberlain. This is evidently a new departure in ecclesiastical architecture." The *Record* points out that such an ornamentation of gargoyles is not so new a departure as *Truth* seems to think. At St. Mary's, Whitechapel, the gargoyle figure-heads are supposed to represent the Old Testament prophets, but it is a subject of common remark that the carvings bear a very close resemblance to the appearance of the various rectors of St. Mary's.

THE Dean of Winchester has again kindly offered personally to conduct parties over his cathedral. Writing to the *Hants Chronicle*, he says :—" 1. On Wednesday, September 7, at 4.30, and on Thursday, September 8, at 5.30, I propose to visit the exterior of the building, cathedral, and close, and to explain, so far as I can, the character and arrangements of the ancient priory of St. Swithin. 2. On Wednesday, September 14th, at 4.30, and on Thursday, September 15th, at 5.30, I shall be prepared to go over the cathedral, studying its architectural features and uses ; it provides such fine and early examples of the different styles that it forms a kind of handbook of the subject. 3. On Wednesday, September 21, directly after service, as it is a saint's day, and on Thursday, September 22, at 5.30, I propose to take the historical points of interest connected with the building, including with it a visit to the great chantries and the most important tombs. It is clear we must not tie ourselves down absolutely to this scheme, as fine days are needful for the outside walk. Granted, however, that Sept. 7 and 8 are fine, we shall, I hope, adhere to the plan laid down. I trust, finally, that our visitors will kindly remember that they can greatly add to the interest of the visits by asking intelligent questions ; they can also help me materially by correcting me whenever, as must sometimes be the case, I slip in the course of talk into errors of name or date or the like ; and I shall also be grateful if they will remind me when in forgetfulness I omit to show things which should be shown."

THE Bishop of London has received a remonstrance from a number of ballet-dancers at present fulfilling engagements in his lordship's diocese. Referring to the charge that they appeared on the stage in indecent dresses, the ladies of the ballet say :—" Now we, members of the Christian Church, earning our living by dancing, beg to protest against this monstrous and shameful charge which you, the chief pastor in the diocese, have brought against us, and to declare that it is absolutely false. We do not, my lord, expect justice at your lordship's hands, but we intend to publish this protest against the foul accusation which your lordship has publicly brought against us."

IT is proposed to present Mrs. Benson with a token of affection from the people of Cornwall. As the Truro Cathedral was begun by Archbishop Benson, the opening of that building is considered a fit time for the presentation of the memorial to Mrs. Benson, and October 13th is named as the last day upon which subscriptions can be received.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bardsley, Rev. Canon C. W., Vicar of Ulverston ; Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man.

Bardsley, Rev. J. W., Vicar of Huddersfield ; Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man.

Bazell, Rev. Charles, Vicar of St. John's, Estover, Bridgwater.

Bigg, Rev. George Howard, M.A., Vicar of Harrowden Magna cum Harrowden Parva, Northamptonshire.

Brereton, Rev. A. T., Curate of Christ Church, Stafford ; Curate-in-Charge of St. Luke's, Dukinfield, Cheshire.

Croome, Rev. William Michell, M.A., Rector of Islip, Northamptonshire.

Cumming, Rev. Arthur H., Vicar of Whorlton ; Rector of Loftus-in-Cleveland.

De Mowbray, Rev. J. H. T. M., M.A., Rector of Knossington, Leicestershire ; Rural Dean of Goscote, Division I.

Fawkes, Rev. R. Wentworth, Rector of Frant, Tunbridge Wells ; Vicar of High Harrogate.

Fox, Rev. S. W. Darwin, M.A., Secretary of the Church of England Parochial Missions Society ; Vicar of St. Paul's, Maidstone.

Frost, Rev. Charles Christopher, Curate-in-Charge of St. Paul's, Farrington, Preston.

Gamson, Rev. Charles R., Chaplain to the *Ajax*.

Gill, Rev. Hugh Stowell, Vicar of Kirk Malew, Isle of Man ; Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man.

Gowan, Rev. W. B., Senior Curate of St. Matthew's, Walsall ; Vicar of Ketley, Shropshire.

Griffiths, Rev. W., Vicar of Sedgley and Rural Dean of Himley; Rector of Shelsley Beauchamp, Worcestershire.

Harrison, Rev. Edward Henry, M.A., Rector of Ashow, Kenilworth ; Vicar of Kington with Huntingdon.

Hughes-Games, Ven. Archdeacon, Rector of Kirk Andreas, Isle of Man ; Chaplain to the Bishop of Sodor and Man.

Hunter, Rev. Henry C. F., Chaplain to the *Edinburgh*.

Johnson, Rev. G. W., Curate-in-Charge of St. Mark's, Walsall; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Short-heath.

Lysaght, Hon. and Rev. Henry, Vicar of Sidlesham, Chichester.

M'Arthur, Rev. James, Rector of Lamplugh, near Cockermouth, Cumberland ; Vicar of St. Mary's, Vincent Square, Westminster.

MacManus, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Somerby, Leicestershire.

Moss, Rev. Henry Whitehead. M.A., Head Master of Shrewsbury School ; Prebendary of Eigne in Hereford Cathedral.

Smith, Rev. W. E., Curate of Brightwell, near Wallingford ; Vicar of Corton, Suffolk.

Taylor-Taswell, Rev. Stephen Taswell, M.A., Rector of Witherley, Leicestershire.

Whitefoord, Rev. Benjamin, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, Salisbury ; Prebendary of Shipton in Salisbury Cathedral.

◆

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Haviland, Rev. John, late Rector of Hartlebury, Worcestershire, at Bournemouth, on the 26th ult., aged 66.

Hildyard, Rev. James, B.D., for forty years Rector of Ingoldsby, and J.P. for the parts of Kesteven, Lincolnshire, at Ingoldsby, Grantham, on the 27th ult., aged 78.

Jollye, Rev. Hunting, Rector of Knoddishall, at Knoddishall, on the 23rd ult., in his 91st year.

Napier, Rev. Alexander, M.A., Vicar, at Holkham Vicarage, on the 24th ult., aged 73.

Rowlatt, Rev. John Charles, Priest-Vicar of Exeter Cathedral, at the Close, Exeter, on the 24th inst., aged 71.

Smith, Rev. William Alexander, M.A., youngest son of the late John Smith, Esq., banker, Leeds, in London, on the 22nd ult., aged 47.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE ZENANA MISSION.

By the Rev. EDWARD A. STUART, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Holloway.

Annual Sermon Preached before the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society, at St. James's, Paddington, April 27th, 1887.

"All that thou commandest us we will do, and withersoever thou sendest us we will go."—Joshua i. 16.

"ALL that thou commandest us we will do, and withersoever thou sendest us we will go." Right royal words, my brethren, and all the more remarkable when you consider the previous history of the tribes that spake them. Only a few months before they had come to Moses, their leader, and had besought him (in the thirty-second chapter of the Book of Numbers, in the first and following verses) to permit them to settle down upon the newly conquered territory of Bashan and of Gilead. We read that these two tribes and a half had a great multitude of cattle, and when they saw the land of Jazer, and the land of Gilead, and saw that the place was a place for cattle, they came to Moses, and spake to him, saying, "Even the country which the Lord smote before the congregation of Israel, is a place for cattle, and thy servants have cattle: wherefore, said they, if we have found grace in thy sight, let this land be given unto thy servants for a possession, and bring us not over Jordan."

Apparently without a single thought of their brethren, they desired to settle down upon these fertile plains. Forgetful of all that they owed to their prowess and to their arms, they thought only of selfish ease. In the sixth verse Moses at once, with burning words, put their meanness and selfishness to shame. "What," said he, "shall your brethren go to war, and shall ye sit here? And wherefore discourage ye the heart of the children of Israel from going over into the land which the Lord hath given them?"

Not only was their conduct most reprehensible because of its selfishness, but also on account of the evil effect it would have on the *morale* of the whole nation. God had made them one army; He had entrusted the whole nation with the conquest of Palestine; and here they thought they might shirk the war, and not take their part in the campaign. No; even if they wished to enjoy the fertile territory, yet surely common gratitude would oblige them to fight for their brethren, by whose arms the land had been won, until they also received their inheritance—not to speak of the love that they ought to have for those who had accompanied them all those years in the wilderness, and who had shared with them all their toils and all their dangers.

This plain speaking on the part of Moses was not without effect. The leaders retired, and then came forward again, in the sixteenth verse of that same chapter, with the following proposal: that they should build sheepfolds for their cattle, and cities for their little ones, and that then all the men should go ready armed before the children of Israel until they had brought them into their place; "and our little ones shall dwell in the fenced cities, because of the inhabitants of the land. We will not return unto our houses until the children of Israel have inherited every man his inheritance."

This proposal Moses is willing to accept, with one amendment. He makes them clearly understand that they are not so much to go over before the children of Israel as before the Lord; it is not to be simply love for their brethren, but obedience to God's commandments, that is to take them across the river; and now here, in this first Book of Joshua, in the sixteenth verse, we have the same tribes coming forward faithfully to fulfil their part of the agreement, and approaching Moses' successor, Joshua, with these glorious words, "All that thou commandest us we will do, and whithersoever thou sendest us we will go. According as we hearkened unto Moses in all things, so will we hearken unto thee: only the Lord thy God be with thee, as He was with Moses."

I trust, my dear brethren, some such determination lies upon our hearts to-day. We have recently in the metropolis had some marvellous meetings, and I believe those simultaneous gatherings have had a result of which time alone can gauge the effect. I believe that Missionary work will be looked upon from a higher platform. It will be looked upon, not simply as the hobby of some particular individual, or the work of some special Society, but the life-work for the whole Church of Christ; and every one of us will feel that as the Church of Christ is fulfilling its missionary obligations, so it is really fulfilling the great purpose for which it was formed.

I know most of those who are listening to me this morning have their missionary zeal already kindled, and are striving to do what they can for the spread of the Master's Kingdom. We thank God, brethren, for the work which He has permitted your Society already to do. We thank God for those ninety ladies who have gone forth to the mission-field. We thank God for those fourteen of them who have gone forth as entirely honorary workers, and for the other six, who draw no salary whatsoever from your Society. We thank God for those 2,400 consecrated Amazons, as they have been called, who have been sent forth by Christendom into the missionary field abroad. We thank God for the increase of £2,200 in the general income of your Society. We thank God for 700 Associations that are striving to spread an interest in Zenana missions throughout the land; and yet I am quite sure that those who are doing most in the work of the spread of the Gospel of Jesus Christ only realise how much there is still to be done, and how little we are really doing to overtake the great work which still lies before us, and therefore we want all to take up the words of our text this morning: "All that thou commandest us we will do, and whithersoever thou sendest us we will go."

I will strive, in the first place, to discover the motives of the Reubenites for desiring Bashan and Gilead. In the second place, I will ask you to listen to this rebuke of Moses which he gave to their selfishness; in the third place, I would ask you to note the glorious result of this plain speaking on the part of the servant of the Lord.

I. In the first place, what were the motives which led the children of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh to desire their inheritance on the eastern part of Jordan? I find most of the commentators agree that one reason was pride. Reuben was the first-born of the children of Israel, but he had forfeited his birthright, and we know how often this thought rankled in his tribe. In the sixteenth chapter of Numbers they come forward, when they perceive that Levi is taking the lead among the children of Israel, to claim their part, as they consider it their right to be the leaders of the people. And now that they are entering the promised land, Judah seems to be in the forefront, leading the van in the place of honour, and Reuben seems to imagine, "If I cannot get the best plot, at any rate I will have the first." Gad also is the first-born of Zilpah, and the younger brethren of the handmaids seem to be placed over him. Manasseh, the first-born son of Joseph, perceives his younger brother Ephraim taking his place according to the blessing of the grandfather Jacob. These three first-born sons therefore seem to league themselves together to obtain the first inheritance, the most fertile inheritance, in these plains of Bashan and Gilead

My brethren, do we not trace the same pride, although, perhaps, shown in a different way, amongst ourselves? Do we not frequently find Christian people speak contemptuously of the negro, the Hindu, and the native? Do we not even trace the same contemptuous pride sometimes lurking in our own hearts? I believe, if missionary work is to be carried on with success, we must get rid of this insular pride; we must feel, as General Gordon advised the missionaries who came to him in the Soudan, "If you want to do anything with my people, you must love my people." And it is only as we look upon them as brethren and sisters that we shall be able to influence the native tribes withersoever our missionaries may go. And after all, is there anything so much for us to be proud of, when we see how these young Uganda boys can stand the fire, when we see that young Punjab lad refusing 50,000 rupees if only he will deny his Saviour, when we see so many lives which have been brought out of the heathen darkness? A young Mohammedan declared it was impossible for any one to live in the precepts of Jesus Christ, and having heard of a catechist living all by himself, away from Christian friends and Christian society, he asked leave to live with him for a fortnight, to see if it was possible for a professing Christian to live according to the precepts of his religion; and after having lived with him for a fortnight, having examined every detail of his private life and of his public teaching, the Mohammedan comes seeking baptism, for he says, "I have found one man who is living in the commandments of Jesus Christ." Which of us could stand the fire as these young Uganda boys did? which of us would refuse the bribe? which of us would bear the inspection into our private life of some enemy for a full fortnight? Is there anything so much for us to be proud of, my brethren! Rather ought we not to sink our faces in the dust, that our religion comes so frequently short of those whom we ofttimes despised?

2. Another reason, I suppose, why these tribes chose these fields, was on account of the worldly advantage. They saw it was a place for cattle, and they had cattle; and, brethren, they were not the first, they were not the last, who have been led astray by the lust of the eyes. Our first mother Eve, Lot, Demas—whose name casts a lurid ray across the watery waste of worldliness,—all warn us that too often professing Christians are lulled to sleep and neglect their duty owing to the fascinations of the world about them. Brethren, how many of us are feeding our cattle in the fat pastures of Gilead and Bashan, instead of going forward to the fight, leaving our brethren to fight alone? Believe me, ever since that fifth chapter of Judges; ever since the time that Barak led his captivity captive, there have been great searchings of heart in Reuben. They felt they could not leave their sheep-folds, but all the time conscience told them they ought to buckle on their armour and go forth to help the Lord.

When you look at the worldliness of the Church to-day, is it not the same thing? Are there not many of us placing more upon our bodies than we put in the plates? Are there not many of us who are spending more upon our entertainments than we ever spent upon the spread of the Gospel of Jesus Christ? How many churches are there that are spending more upon their decoration and their music than ever they have spent to carry the Gospel of Jesus Christ to distant lands?

3. A third reason why these two tribes and a half chose their portion upon that eastern side of Jordan, was their unbelief. They had acquired their territory; the territory on the other side would be very difficult to acquire. Their spies had reported years before that the cities were strong and solid. Surely, therefore, it would be far better to settle down upon that which they had already obtained, and not go, for some Quixotic effort, and strive to gain the country on the other side.

Is there not very ofttimes the same unbelief with regard to missionary work? We place our sixpence or our shilling in the plate with a kind of idea that we are giving to some forlorn hope, and we scarcely ever expect to see very much result from it; and yet we have the testimony of even those who are outside to assure us that the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ is still "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." In that remarkable article in the *Quarterly Review* last June it was declared that this Gospel had been tried in almost every land. It has been tried amongst the Esquimaux beneath the North Pole; it has been tried amongst the tribes in the very heart of Africa; it has been tried amongst the aborigines of Australia, and amongst the most cultivated Mohammedans in India; it has been tried amongst the most degraded people of Terra del Fuego, and amongst the most esteemed Brahmins in India, and in every case it has won converts for our Lord and Master. Nobody can say that the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ is not in the present day "the power of God unto salvation" in the missionary field, and therefore we ought to put away this unbelief from us.

4. A fourth reason, I suppose, is their consummate selfishness. They thought only of themselves, their own cattle, and their own worldly advantage, and when Moses put the stern question to them, "Shall your brethren go to war, and ye sit here?" I fancy they were startled. "Well, really, we have never thought of that. It does look rather mean when you look at the question face to face; but we never thought of that; we only thought about our own cattle. We really almost forgot that they had not received their inheritance as yet."

My brethren, is there not that same thoughtless selfishness to-day? How many of us have really realised that there are to-day two hundred millions more Mohammedans and Hindus and heathen than there were in the world a hundred years ago? Which of us has realised that, whereas Christian missions have only made some three millions of converts, Hinduism, Mohammedanism, Brahminism, Buddhism, and heathenism have increased some two hundred millions? And have you realised this, that Mohammed, and Buddha, and Brahma are making more converts to-day than the followers of Jesus Christ? and that this increase is not to be accounted for simply by the birth-rate, but they are actually making more converts from heathenism than we are making ourselves?

The reason for this is very clear. Every Mohammedan, every Buddhist, and every follower of Brahma is a missionary himself; he does not delegate this work to some special men who have been set apart for the purpose, but every Mohammedan as he presses into the interior of Africa carries his religion with him; every Buddhist who presses on to China carries Buddha with him; every Hindu who is being pressed to go amongst the hill tribes is carrying his Hinduism with him; and God grant that the time will soon come when not only our recognised missionaries, but every Christian engineer, every Christian clerk, and every Christian soldier may realise he also is a missionary for Jesus Christ.

II. It was against all this selfishness and thoughtlessness that Moses directed this his shaft: "Shall your brethren go to war, and shall ye sit here?"

1. Think, in the first place, of how much you owe those brethren. Who won these fields of Bashan and Gilead? God, you reply. Quite true, it was God who slew Og, the king of Bashan, and Sihon, the king of the Amorites. It is God who gave you this good and fertile land; but whose swords flashed from their scabbards in order to rout the foe? They were the swords of Judah, of Ephraim, and of Benjamin. And shall these our brethren go to war while you sit here and enjoy that for which they have fought?

And, my brethren, the argument holds good today. To whom do we owe the peacefulness we enjoy? God? Ay, God, indeed! It is God who has flooded our land with Gospel light. It is God who has brought home to us the glorious blessings of the Gospel; but, under God, to whom do we owe all these benefits?

First of all, to the Jew; to the Jew for the wondrous preservation of the Word of God; to the Jew for the first great missionaries to mankind. And what do we repay unto them?

Then, how much do we owe to Ireland? The Gospel came to England from Ireland. Columba crossed over from Ireland to Iona, and commenced the preaching of the Gospel. Alas! we reap the fruit to-day of what we neglected to do for Ireland.

May we not use the same arguments, a little differently perhaps, with regard to India? We may not, perhaps, have received spiritual blessings from India, but have we not received temporal blessings? Many in our families, all of us as a nation, have received temporal blessings from that land; and ought they not to reap of us spiritual things? Shall, then, our brethren go to war, and shall we sit here?

2. Think, also, how God has made us one army. The conquest of Palestine was given to the whole of the children of Israel. They were put in trust with the land; and who were these two tribes and

a half that they should divide the army? that whilst some should go to war, the others should rest at their ease? Brethren, it is to the whole Church of Christ that God has committed His missionary work, not simply to the apostles, not simply to some special caste, or some special Society, but the command is given unto all, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." It was given, I think to those five hundred brethren, who saw the Lord after His resurrection, and not simply to the twelve apostles. And who are we that we should look at a few going into the world, whilst the rest of the army sit down upon the fat lands of Gilead and Bashan?

3. And then a third thing. Think of the dangers our brethren have to encounter. "Shall they go to war, and shall we sit here?"

This argument comes home to us with special power this year; it comes home to us from that village in the Masai country, where the martyr Bishop has laid down his life; it comes to us from the dying bed of the young missionary Sims, who dies of starvation close to the North Pole; it comes to us from the aged missionary, who writes home saying, "I am too old to get up at five o'clock in the morning, and stand for four or five hours preaching in the market-place;" it comes to us from the missionary Bishop, who writes home saying that he has been out now seven years, and there has not been sent one single man.

It comes to you from your own Society; it comes to you from your aged missionary at Batala, who had gone out to the Mission when over sixty years of age; it comes to you from another, broken down in health, long past the prime of life, who is working among the villages in the Punjab; it comes to you from your veteran missionary who has been for twenty-five years bearing the burden and heat of the fight. "And shall these your sisters go to war, and shall ye sit here?"

Remember what Moses spake to these tribes. In the twenty-third verse of that thirty-second chapter he warned them, "Be sure your sin will find you out." We have ofttimes quoted those words, but have you ever realised the context in which they occur? They do notrefer to a murder; they do not refer to some theft; they refer to the indolence of God's people; they refer to the shirking of their duty upon the part of the army of Christ. "Be sure your sin will find you out." Did I say they referred to no murder? They refer to the most heartless murder—the murder of souls. Did I say they referred to no theft? They refer to the most impudent theft—the defalcation on the part of those of us who are accounted stewards, who are put in stewardship of the Gospel. "Be sure," brethren, "your sin will find you out."

III. Thank God, this plain speaking of Moses was not without effect, and we have the result, first of all, in the thirty-second chapter of Numbers, and then the carrying out of that promise in the text to-day. They suggested first of all that they should provide for their children. I do not find fault with them on that account. We must provide for the spiritual wants of our children. I would not have one single penny diverted from mission work at home for mission work abroad. Let us preach the Gospel in the most degraded places at home, but that will not interfere one whit with the carrying of the Gospel into distant lands Let us provide for our children, but we ourselves will go to fight the battles of the Lord. And now here they come before Joshua to carry this out into execution: "All that thou commandest us we will do, and whithersoever thou sendest us we will go."

Look, brethren, at that glorious missionary band as it now goes forth some forty thousand strong. O God, grant that we may see such an army go forth to the spiritual battles of the Lord! And look at these hosts. If you can catch the spiritual characteristics of these three tribes, you have the chief characteristics so necessary for the missionary band.

Reuben; who was Reuben? Reuben was so called because he was the first-born son of Jacob. His mother called him Reuben—"behold a son;" and, brethren, if you are going forth to the missionary work, you must realise your sonship, your marvellous sonship. "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God." You must realise your sonship.

In the second place, Gad—"a troop," for "behold a troop cometh." There must be the union of the army, the union of worker with worker, a union of Christian with Christian.

Manasseh, too,—he called his name Manasseh, for he said, "God has caused me to forget all my affliction and my toil." And so you must forget; forget all your own needs, forget all your own affliction in time past; forget not God's love; forget not the duty to which He calls you to go forth, realising your sonship. Band together in glorious unity and forget all the past.

Now, then, "All that thou commandest us we will do." I have not attempted to-day to bring before you any of the open doors which are before your Society, although they are many. The call is coming to you from Cashmere, from Japan; the call is coming to you with increased intensity from India itself. That burning question which has been forced upon our public press of child-marriage will doubtless open fresh doors of usefulness for such a Society as this. The marvellous eagerness for books throughout India, the welcome that is given to the singing of the Gospel—all seem to be very marked characteristics of missionary work in the present day.

But I have not attempted to call your attention to open doors, nor, again, to the success which has crowned your efforts. "Do you suppose," said a Brahmin Government inspector in anger, after having inspected one of the schools, "Do you suppose that these girls are going to grow up Hindus?" No, we don't, but it is only a testimony on the part of the Brahmin as to the thoroughness of the Christian education which is there given. "It is a wonderful thing," said a poor villager, "to see the Brahmin lady coming to read to us," and yet that wonderful thing has been seen in the villages of India.

I have tried to bring before you to-day rather the principles on which you should work in answer to the call which God gives to us to rouse us from our indolence, and so to go forth to the work of the Lord. There is only one other verse to which I will call your attention, the seventeenth verse, in this chapter of Joshua. They said, "According as we hearkened unto Moses in all things, so will we hearken unto thee: only the Lord thy God be with thee, as He was with Moses." Who was Moses? Moses was the exponent of the law. And who was Joshua? Joshua was the great type of Jesus Christ. As we hearken to the Law in all things, so will we hearken unto Jesus in all things. Do you know I have placed in the margin of my Bible a reference to Matthew v. 20: "For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven."

Now, Christian friends, I put to you to-day: If God had come by His servant Moses on Mount Sinai, and had declared to us, "Except ye go and preach the Gospel to every creature, ye cannot be saved," would we not, many of us, go? But he comes down from the Mount of Beatitude and gives to us a free Gospel, which is not to be the reward of work done on our own part, but which is the purchase of His own blood. Oh shall not we, who would have obeyed Moses in all things—shall we not speed forth much more willingly to obey Jesus, as we owe to Him all upon which we build our hopes for time and for eternity? "All that Thou, Lord Jesus, commandest us we will do, and whithersoever Thou sendest us we will go," whether it be to the most degraded hovel in London, or to the most benighted Zenana in India; whether it be to our own servants, or whether it be to the heathen abroad—"whithersoever Thou sendest us we will go." As we have so ofttimes said at the table of the Lord, "Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee," so "Whatsoever Thou commandest us we will do, and whithersoever Thou sendest us we will go."

◆

ON Friday, the 2nd inst., Canon Fleming, acting as commissioner for his Grace the Archbishop of York, formally prorogued the Northern Convocation until Friday, the 30th September.

LOVE.

BY REV. E. MARTYN VENN, B.A., RECTOR OF KILKENNY WEST, COUNTY WESTMEATH.

SERMON PREACHED AT KILKENNY WEST, ON ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST'S DAY, 1886.

IN 1 John iv., and part of the 18th verse, you will find these words: "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment." The name of the Apostle, St. John, has ever been connected from the earliest times of the Christian Church with the idea of Love. He it was, who was distinguished above the rest of the twelve by the particular affection of his Divine Master—he was "that disciple whom Jesus loved," who was privileged to lean upon his breast at supper, who was the subject of one of the Lord's latest discourses before his ascension into Heaven. If we read his gospel with anything like attention, we cannot fail to observe how this quality of love is brought into far greater prominence there than in the three synoptic gospels. What more beautiful comparison ever fell from our Lord's lips than that in which He declares Himself to be the Good Shepherd, who loves and will lay down his life for the sheep? What more touching episode can be conceived than the Son of God weeping by the tomb of a lowly and obscure mortal, so that the very bystanders were compelled to say in wonder, "See, how he loved him!" And the key-note of this Epistle of St. John is also love, that love which he teaches us that we ought to feel and show towards our Heavenly Father for His many mercies towards us, most of all that inestimable mercy of the gift of His only-begotten son to die for us upon the Cross. Of St. John, too, it is recorded that, after he had held the Bishopric of Ephesus for many years, and was very old and almost blind, he used to sit at his doors and address those Christians who saluted him, with these words, "Little children love one another." Not without good reason did those masters who have painted his features represent them as illuminated by an almost womanly tenderness and sympathy. Now, it is this grand characteristic which distinguishes our true Christian belief, revealed and taught to us by the Son of God Himself, from the many forms of false religion which are to be found in different parts of the world. For no nation whatever, of which history tells us, has, at any time, been without a belief in a personal Deity, the Creator and Sustainer of the world, and of the human beings dwelling in it. He has, no doubt, been terribly distorted, His worship has been used as a cloak for horrible enormities, He has shared His honour with a host of false divinities of all kinds. But, though obscured by the growth of superstition and idolatry, we can still trace everywhere the idea of a personal Deity. And here let me digress for a few moments, in order that I may point out to you how powerful an argument this is against the atheism of the present day, which denies the existence of any God at all, and attributes the formation of the universe to chance, or to laws which, when analysed by logic, are resolved into that same chance. Our position, as believers in God, is this: the oldest book in the world, the Bible, tells us of some kind of worship everywhere. Next in antiquity to the Bible are the Sanskrit Vedas, written probably about 1,200 B C. The same record is found in them. No traveller, from Herodotus down to Dr. Livingstone, has recorded any nation which knew not God in some form. Samoyedes in the North, Polynesians in the South, Chinese, Egyptians, Norsemen, all worshipped after their own dark and unenlightened manner. When Pizarro discovered the Incas of South America, and Cortes the Aztecs of the North—and that is an entirely new hemisphere quite unconnected, as far as we know, with the old—they found the worship of a Supreme God firmly established in both those mysterious nations. Now, how are we to account for the antiquity and universality of their belief in a great and mighty Being, the governor of the universe? It is scarcely possible to suppose that, in rude and primitive ages of the world, men could have invented this belief—evolved it out of their inner consciousness, as the phrase is—and, even if it were possible, how are we to account for the simultaneous appearance of the phenomenon in all parts of the world at a time when communication must have been impossible, as far as we can see, between most of those parts? There is only one reasonable explanation of this astonishing fact, and that is—its truth. Our Biblical account of God and the creation of the world is true, and this belief must have been a legacy which all nations received from their several founders, a legacy which in all cases but one became in time fearfully degenerate and corrupt, but which, even amid all the wickedness and perversion of idolatry, contained still the germ of truth—that God is, and is the rewarder of them that do right. It might be possible, indeed, to suppose, with the Epicurean poet of Rome, that the laws which forbid theft and murder and other crimes had their origin merely in men's fear of their neighbours, from the necessities of social life; but no such reason can conceivably be assigned as the cause of their universal worship in some shape, perverted and horrible though it may have been, of a mighty power, different from and far superior to mankind. I have spoken thus, not because I suppose that any of you here assembled are atheists, but because faith in these days is cold, and some even openly deny God. It may be that some even of you may hereafter be brought into contact with such persons; then how deep will be your shame, and how great their triumph, if you cannot give a reason for the faith that is in you. And now let me return from this digression to the thread of my discourse.

You may recollect that I was saying that our true Christian belief, as regards its character—for I am not speaking now of the great facts of the Incarnation and Atonement—is honourably distinguished from corrupt and idolatrous systems of religion by the force with which it insists upon the exhibition of love by its members, both towards men and towards God. What nobler precept, what purer maxim can be found the whole world through than this, "Love your enemies, bless them which curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you?" How different is that to the tone of Confucius, who is revered in China as the greatest moralist and greatest man who had ever lived there. He bade his followers never rest till they had slain the man who had killed any of their friends or relatives. But laying aside the duty of charitable feeling towards our fellow-men, I intend to confine the rest of my remarks this morning to the subject of that love which our faith bids us show to our Heavenly Father, and which is so characteristic a mark of our Christian profession.

Taking a comprehensive view of the various forms of religion, with which history or experience has made us best acquainted, and leaving out of account the different kinds of fetish worship, which are little more than varieties of the black art of magic, or puerile imitations of it, we find that men have been from all time urged by them to do good and shun evil by the hope of rewards or the fear of punishments in a future life. The Greeks and Romans read in their mythology and poetry many a story of the tortures of Tartarus, and the joys of the Elysian fields, and the judges who in the lower world assigned its fate to each soul that entered its portals. Modern Brahminism tells of many different heavens and hells, in one of which every Hindoo who dies will find that place which his good or evil doing has merited. Buddhism, a religion which ignores the existence of a God—if that be not a misnomer—and denies the existence of the soul, must of course incite men to goodness by other means, which are found in the doctrine of transmigration. It teaches that he who has purified himself in this life by contemplation on good works, will then rid himself of the burden of future existence, which it would have been necessary for him to undergo if he had lived an evil life here, and will be brought much nearer to that final goal of all his wishes—his re-absorption into the source whence he originally sprang into previous existences — his extinction as a living entity. Mohammedanism, on the other hand, holds in all its rigour the doctrine of heaven and hell. The Moslem is told that at death he will have to pass over a bridge as fine as a razor's edge—that over this the wicked will fall into the pit of torture, but that Mohammed will stretch out his hand and enable the good to pass it in safety, and so to reach Paradise, which lies upon the other side.

The very Vikings, who were such a terror to Europe in the period between 800 and 1000 A.D., were incited to do due honour to Thor and Wodin by the hope of receiving in Valhalla such a reward as was most suited to their rugged and fierce natures—the privilege of drinking mead out of the skulls of their enemies.

I need not waste much time in telling you that the motives of hope and fear are operative in our Christian religion, as well as in those false, distorted forms of worship, of which I have just been speaking; and this seems, to my mind, a fair reason for believing that in all of them alike, however foul they may have become by corrupt and idolatrous practices, however childish they may seem to us from the mummeries with which they have been overlaid, however much they may have been diverted from their true purpose to serve the selfish interests of particular classes of men—there is yet to be discerned the germ of a great and universal truth, that God *is*, and is the rewarder of them that serve Him, and the punisher of them who despise Him. And this truth, as I imagine, must have been handed down from those dim, forgotten ages in the past, when the world was young, and when man enjoyed a closer communion with his Maker than now. To it probably St. Paul refers in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, where we find these words: "When the Gentiles, which have not the law (*i.e.*, the law of Moses), do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves. Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."

But if Christianity resembles other and false forms of religion in having hope and fear as inducements to goodness on the part of its members, in other respects it differs from them as widely as pole from pole. It is raised far above them by the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement, to which, though there may be a tendency in England to discredit them, as the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol said in his visitation address a short time ago, "I am sure that all we in this country will cling most ardently as sincere Protestants". It is raised far above them in character by that love which it teaches us to show to our heavenly Father in return for His great and constant love to us. Where is there any trace in the records of Greek or Roman religion of filial affection towards Jupiter? Is there any trace of love on the part of the Mohammedan towards Allah, or in that of the Hindoo towards Brahmin, Vishnu, or Siva? No, indeed! Fear there may be, or that kind of gratefulness which consists of a lively sense of favours to come, but of love there is none. This is a characteristic of Christianity alone, and this it is which more perhaps than any other part of the internal as opposed to the external evidence in its favour, stamps it as the only true and heaven-born form of religion. It never entered, perhaps it never could have entered, into the brain of man to conceive that love was the true bond of relation between him and his Maker. That teaching originated with the Son of God Himself. In comparison with this, what low motives must fear and hope ever appear! They are ever selfish, but this is not. They appeal to a lower side of human nature, this to a higher. Here then is the pure and lofty ideal to which all Christians should ever strive to attain—that they should love God, because He has so loved us, and because He so loves us still. And with this feeling uppermost in our minds, we shall ever be content to bear calmly whatever measure of good or evil fortune He may send us, because we have an implicit trust in His love and goodness. And with this feeling we shall ever strive to obey His precepts, because we are sure that, coming from Him, they must be the best for us, even though it may seem otherwise—and still more, because we shall hate and shrink from the idea of doing anything which is displeasing to the great and good Being who so loves us, and whom we so love. Is not this an infinitely higher motive than to do good merely because we hope for reward or fear punishment hereafter? We acknowledge it to be so always in matters of earthly interest, and why should it be otherwise in those which are spiritual? Which of you that is a father or a mother would be content if you thought that your little ones obeyed your orders merely that they might thereby gain a toy or avoid the rod? Is there one of you that would not a thousand times sooner have them obedient to you because of the mutual love that you bore one to another? Which of you that is a master or mistress would be content if you thought that your servants performed their duty punctually merely that they might thereby earn an increase of wages or avoid dismissal? Is there one of you that would not a thousand times sooner have them eager to do you good service because of the mutual sympathy and love that you bore one to another? What commander of an army would not infinitely prefer the willing service which was prompted by the love of his soldiers, to that which was extorted from them by the fear of the lash? History will answer that question, and in no uncertain tone. Believe me, love will achieve greater results in every way than either fear or hope or duty—and love we should show towards God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for their great and inestimable love towards us.

Not long ago a great English Churchman remarked that in the present state of religious feeling and thought we could only hope to make men good by the fear of hell. Now I cannot believe this to be true of any but a limited number, and those the lowest and coarsest natures. What! are we to believe that there are none among us who are actuated by higher motives than that—that there are none who are conscious of that great gulf which their own depravity creates between themselves and God, and who long for truth and purity and holiness, because they recognise that these qualities are intrinsically beautiful, and the only ones which can ever merit the approbation of God? Are there none who, when they repeat the opening words of the Lord's prayer, "Our Father which art in heaven," really appreciate the beauty and value of the relation in which they stand to the Almighty God, who is the Author of their natural and their spiritual life alike? No, I cannot believe that such a deadness of feeling is at all universal. Love, a deep, earnest, and trustful love—that is the motive which should incline us to avoid evil and do good. That is the ideal which every true Christian should set before himself, and the ideal which every clergyman should endeavour unceasingly to set before his congregation. Try, I pray you all, to live up to that standard, and to make it influence your lives practically for good.

We find, no doubt, in our Christian religion, as motives to a good life, the hope of future happiness, and the fear of future punishment; and these are in our belief eternal truths, which it is impossible to controvert, proved not only by direct evidence from God's Word, but by their very universality as well.

But, as I said before, these are flashes of heavenly truth, which have shone even through the darkness of heathendom. Every false, perverted form of worship from all time has held them out as tenets to be believed by its votaries. Is our true Christian faith, then, founded by the Son of God Himself, to rise to no higher level than mere idolatry? God forbid such a thing! Those who study the Gospel and Epistle of St. John will discover without much trouble that the key-note of them is love to God in return for the wonderful love which He has shown and ever does show to us. This is perhaps the chief internal characteristic, which has raised the true faith to a loftiness and sublimity of ideal, which never has been and never can be reached by any form of false religion.

It seems to me that many of us do not sufficiently realise what is meant by this love towards God, and, indeed, of other doctrines of our religion which we continually profess. We have been so accustomed to repeat them from the earliest years of our childhood, that the utterance of them has come to be too mechanical. They are ever in our mouths, but we do not think enough of what is meant by them; we do not meditate upon them with the earnestness which they deserve. Now I do not at all wish to exalt the contemplative over the practical side of our religion, for we have had lamentable instances in our own days of what comes from that; but I certainly do think that the former is ignored far more than it either ought to be or need be. And in this respect we may learn a useful lesson even from those whose doctrines in many most essential points are such as we could never consent to accept. A good many years ago a book was published descriptive of the Novitiate or training which must be undergone by one who desires to become a Jesuit. Its author was a man of the name of Andrew Steinmetz, who had entered himself at Stonyhurst, the great Jesuit College in England, with the intention of taking the vows, but who, being of a thoughtful and self-reliant turn of mind, found the whole system so repugnant to him that he left the College, and with it the Church of Rome, to become a member of the Church of England. But amid a host of errors of doctrine and practice, related by him, there was one which might be imitated even by a Protestant with a good result. It seems that the novices, during the early part of their training, were required to meditate in absolute solitude, and with the utmost concentration of mind of which they were capable, for hours and even days together, upon some particular theme, such as the happiness of heaven or the misery of hell, the full meaning of the wondrous sacrifice on Calvary, and other kindred topics—to represent to their minds a mental picture of each, perfect in the most minute details, and with a personal application of the subject to themselves, so that they might think, "How unutterably happy should *I* be if I win heaven—how unutterably miserable if I lose it. How unutterably thankful should *I* be to the Son of God, who died for me!" And in this way the author says that his mind was so saturated with the contemplation of these topics, that he felt quite assured of his capacity to preach a long extempore sermon upon any of them at a moment's notice, with fluency and exhaustive treatment. It must have been some such training which produced those wonderful French preachers of the time of Louis Fourteenth, Bossuet, Bourdaloue and Massillon, whose impassioned eloquence could at will raise the Grand Monarch and his godless courtiers to the height of Christian joy, or plunge them into the blackest depth of despair.

And though this systematic contemplation of spiritual themes may be the practice of Jesuits, whose principles as a whole can only be regarded by us as things to be avoided, yet in this instance I think many will be of opinion that it is useful to imitate them.

Let all of us, then, find some time, however busy our lives may be, in which to meditate upon the great and life-giving doctrines of our creed, and especially upon this particular point, namely, the love which we ought to show towards God and His Son and Holy Ghost, according as they have shown such love towards us. Let us also be careful to teach our children to look in this light upon their Father, which is in heaven, remembering that this was assuredly the teaching of our Blessed Lord, while He was in human form upon earth. So we shall gain the greater help in times of distress and doubt, so we shall have a clearer and brighter life to guide our feet among the many pitfalls which beset our journey heavenwards, and so we shall have the very highest motive of all for showing obedience to all those commandments, which He has been pleased to institute for our observance.

◆

THE *Manchester Guardian* is informed that the Bishop, acting upon the advice of his Rural Deans and other official clergy, has appointed the Rev. Robert Catterall, Rector of St. Philip's, Bradford Road, Manchester, to the office of Missioner for the diocese.

SOME of the parishioners of Bishop Cramer Roberts at Blackburn have requested him to administer the Holy Communion after evening service, but the Right Rev. prelate (who is the assistant of the Bishop of Manchester) has declined to do so, on the ground that evening celebrations are "irregular and an innovation."

THE *Record* "regrets to learn that the living of Barnborough, near Doncaster, vacant by the death of Canon Ware, has been conferred by the Lord Chancellor upon the Rev. George Edward Cole, Rector of Exhall, Alcester. An Evangelical incumbent is accordingly displaced by a High Churchman, who signed Dean Church's memorial in favour of the toleration of ritual."

THE Rector of Bottesford, near Belvoir Castle, Canon Norman, having carefully considered the earnest solicitations of the churchwardens, supported by the unanimous entreaties of his parishioners, has unconditionally withdrawn his resignation of his benefice, which he proposed to leave on account of failing health. The Rev. R. M. Norman, who has been curate of the parish for nearly twelve months, has surrendered his promotion to the rectory, and consented to take the spiritual charge of a much less lucrative benefice in the Vale of Belvoir.

MR. ERNEST LEE, the architect of St. Mary Matfelon, Whitechapel, writes to correct the statement that portraits of eminent persons had been used for gargoyles at that church. He says:—"I introduced into the internal corbels supporting the vaulting shafts of the nave several portraits of those who are or had been connected with the parish—*e.g.*, the Bishop of Bedford, the late Dean Champneys, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Kitto, and the present Rector, Mr. Robinson. I cannot think that any architect, even in these days of scant respect, would dream of utilising the features of such good men for gargoyles, which, as your readers need hardly be reminded, were in the middle ages used for the purpose of carrying off waste water, and were invariably treated as grotesques."

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
From Mrs. LAVANIA FOWLER, 2, New Pond Cottage, Romsey, Hants.
"It affords me great pleasure to state that your **ELECTROPATHIC BELT** has not only removed the pain I have so long suffered, but has been the means of so strengthening my **spine** as to prevent the recurrence of any difficulty I have had in breathing."
SPINAL WEAKNESS.
Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of the **Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,** should at once stop physicing, and remit 21*s.* for HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials POST FREE. **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1887.

ARTISAN ATHEISM.

THIS important subject has been discussed very recently in the columns of one of the ecclesiastical newspapers, and also in one of the monthly magazines. Various suggestions have been made as to the best way of dealing with it, and combating the errors which exist.

That there is a certain amount of atheism in our large towns there can be no doubt, but that it exercises any great influence we very much question. In one of the large manufacturing towns in the north of England, with a population of nearly 300,000, the atheists are so insignificant in number that they have only one small hall for their meetings, and that in a back street, and we believe that it is the same in other large towns. As a body the infidels are numerically weak, and their influence is not anything like so great as some would imagine. The great difficulty in the present day is the spirit of utter indifference which pervades to a great extent the working classes, the labourers, and the artisans. This is borne out very clearly by those who have had experience in dealing with the large masses of population.

But where atheism has made its appearance among working men, there is generally some cause for it; for instance, we have been told by a clergyman who worked in a large town parish, that whenever he met an atheist, and began to talk to him, it generally appeared that the man's view of religion was warped and distorted, and that his general view of Christianity was, that it was Calvinism, viz., that some were predestinated to eternal life, while others were predestinated to eternal death, and this the man naturally revolted against.

Further, we are afraid that in many cases the evil example of some who have professed Christianity, but whose lives have not been in accordance with the profession, has led many to question whether, in the face of such hypocrisy, there was any truth in Christianity at all, or whether it was not a mere sham and hollow pretence. So, again, many men have lost their faith, and have got distorted views of Christianity in consequence of the numerous fallacious statements that have been put forward by so-called teachers of Christianity. In one town the members of the Secularist Club invited the clergy to go and discuss with them on Sunday evenings certain subjects. We know one clergyman who accepted their invitation, and who used to go to their meetings, but when it came to a matter of sound reasoning, they could not maintain their position. They had taken the words of some preacher, and discussed them, but this clergyman, repudiating other people's statements, challenged them to prove their point, and referred them to the Word of God. The whole thing seemed to lie in this—they took the statement of some person, and attempted to deduce from it the fact that such was wrong, instead of taking the Word of God, and basing their arguments upon it, *pro* and *con*. The fact is, in dealing with this question, we must put before men plain doctrinal statements, which must be supported by proof from Holy Scripture, and this will confute the atheist far more than anything else. In some cases public discussion will do good, but it is only practised men who can be trusted to deal with such questions. Years ago a certain Dissenting minister took up the cudgels against Mr. Holyoake in a public discussion, and when unable to meet the infidel's attack, he replied with bitter sarcasm, forgetting that abuse is not argument, and that such action only tends to embitter men's minds against Christianity.

One great means of counteracting the insidious attacks of atheism, is for the clergy to make greater attempts to win the working men. In the round of parochial visiting, a clergyman very often only sees the women and the children, the men being out at work, while there is a delicacy in calling in the evening when the man is at home after the day's work, for fear, it may be, of intruding into the home circle. Yet if done wisely, visits in the evening are often welcomed by a working man, who does not object to talk to his clergyman when once the ice is broken. In one parish a clergyman began visiting in the evening, and even stayed and had his supper with the people, with the result that the working man was loud in his praises of the clergyman. So, also, the establishment of working men's clubs, on a sound basis, will be productive of much good. It brings the men into contact with the clergy, and at these clubs social discussions on various topics can be arranged, and so, by wise judgments and careful forethought, much of that intercourse of the clergy with the working men can be brought about, and also the feeling which working men have against the clergy, the result of prejudice and distrust, be got over. The formation of working men's societies for the furtherance of Church work, the breaking down as far as possible of the difference between class and class, will be extremely beneficial; and even if atheism be not touched, it will be something to break down that barrier of cold, icy indifference which pervades the working class. In the pulpit, in clubs, and in all dealings with working men, let there be clear statements of truth, spoken in love, and at the same time showing a true sympathy for them. This will do more than anything else to help forward God's work, and be an effectual barrier against atheism and indifference.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

JOHN VI.—RITUALISTIC GLOSSES.—LETTER II.

SIR,—It has been said that our Lord purposely multiplied the loaves in order to prepare men for the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Of His purposes we know nought, unless from Divine explanation. We have none here; so His purpose remains a secret to us.

2. Multiplication is the term applied to the loaves. But is not sub-division a better word to use? We talk of mankind being multiplied, and of the seed being multiplied a hundred-fold in the harvest. But of the loaves, we can imagine not that one loaf made many more, but that, being infinitely sub-divided, each atom was enlarged, so that all had more than abundance. See Wiseman, p. 252, "Not an increase of number."

3. But how can sub division be applied to the Holy Eucharist? Is God in each wafer? Are there innumerable gods? We must understand which it is we profess to believe. It will not do to say, "I believe I know not what." Romanists say that our soul is in every part of our body. This is by way of an Eucharistic illustration. But it is not true that our soul is in every part of our body, if a limb were cut off. So the illustration fails.

4. It is impossible to keep Ritualists to anything they say. I remember when they said that ubiquity belongs as much to our Lord's humanity as to His Deity. But as that would make consecration useless, it seems now to be given up. Our Irish Oracle said, on Jan. 8th, that our Lord's Body may be in ninety places at once. But on March 5th it wheels round, and says, "Wherever there is a limitation of Presence, we may understand it of that inferior nature which can alone be absent." So the "ninety places" theory vanishes into thin air.

5. I was lately pressing a layman with our Church's decisions as to our Lord's human nature being "bound by the limits that condition a material clod." The answer was: 'As a layman, I am bound by Scripture alone." But this is plainly setting up his own view of Scripture against the view of the same Scripture,

taken by the Church from the beginning. I say "from the beginning," for it is on that that our Church framed its decisions. Of course the Ritualistic layman will resort to the despised Puritan right of private judgment, and say, with Chillingworth, "The Bible alone is the religion of Protestants." But what shall we say of the clergyman who despises the Articles which he signs, the services which he uses, and the Catechism out of which he teaches? What, but that he plays the hypocrite for place and pay, or that he may train the laity to take a step which he shrinks from taking himself?

6. "This is my Body" is to be the sole foundation for a gross presence and adoration. But these words must go with our Lord's *addenda*, "Body broken" and Blood spilt from His veins; His *Cadaver*, in fact. Of that He spake when He said the bread was it. But there is no *Cadaver* now, that the bread should be turned into it. Nothing but a living glorified Body, so the bread cannot be turned into the *Cadaver*, which is not. And our Lord spake nothing of the living glorified Body. If we must stand by Scripture, it must be as it really is, not as Rome has clipped it.

7. It is vain to talk of the Trinity. Scripture declares that each person is God. That is enough for us. So it says that the bread is His Body slain, not now existing.

8. It is useless to say, with Aquinas, that our senses are not competent witnesses. If not, then we have no proof of the Resurrection, its only vouchers being the Apostles' senses. Transubstantiation may stand, and the Resurrection may stand. But one or the other must fall. We prefer the Resurrection. Rome prefers Transubstantiation.

9. That our Lord's Body is a natural Body He proved to His Apostles by their sight and touch. He can have no other Body. As a natural Body, and not a spirit, or a spirit-Body, it can be in only one place at a time locally. Spiritually, indeed, it can be with us, as Ridley said to his judges, "by spirit and grace." The sun is our illustration, "there is nothing hid from the heat thereof." The brazen serpent is given to us as a further illustration. Without "actual contact," it gave down health to those who looked to it. Thus, when our Lord was on earth, there went virtue out of Him, and healed all who had faith for healing. Nay, the very shadow of Peter had this beneficial effect. Can we, then, doubt that, though He has ascended up where He was before, He can still send down His healing grace, which must be sufficient for all our needs. Strange, if distance can lessen His power! Strange, if we must touch that flesh which He says profiteth nothing! To what shifts Rome is driven we have an instance in her interpretation of 1 Cor. x. 16: "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?" To avoid the truth, that the bread remaining is the means of our receiving the grace which our Lord calls His Body, the Rheimish Version perverts it thus, "the Body of Christ is the means of uniting us to His Body." After this, Rome will stop at nothing!

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

◆

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND CATECHISM.

SIR,—Will you allow me a few words in reply to Edmund Lawrence? He accuses me, twice over of "impudence." He says that I am "incapable of understanding the meaning of words and the construction of sentences," and "a person who cannot give the merest whiff of plausibility to slander." These are strong charges, though not very courteous. However, as "hard words break no bones," I, after Hooker's example, pass them over, and come to the argument.

I said—I say still—referring to numerous pages of the report of Brooke's Committee of 1871, that the design of that report was to get rid of Priest and Bread altogether. I will give references if required. I spare your space now.

I said, also, that, in the new question and answer, the "given and eaten" of the 28th Article was purposely eschewed. The matter was argued in the Synod, and the majority would not have the words in any form. They were told that, if they refused to explain them in "a heavenly and spiritual manner," Rome would say that we were afraid to deny *their* gross views. But all in vain!

I said that the question and answer are taken, not from the 28th Article alone, but from it and the Catechism combined.

I said that, whereas the report passed over the Catechism as less full, it took its language from the Catechism, exactly because it *was* less full, preferring "taken and received" rather than "given, taken, and eaten."

No one can be more against setting up a rival High English Church in Dublin than I am. I was merely reminding the *Church Times* that Dr. Pusey, *Venerabile nomen!* was in favour of it. The Popery of our only weekly Church paper and the call for Ritualistic help from England looks very much that way. Habitual confession, Masses for the dead, and compulsory clerical celibacy seem to be coming into favour.

He says that, as the object was to explain the "Verily and, indeed, taken and received" of the preceding answer, the question very naturally was as to "taken and received." But as every one knows that, on our part, the only means is a due state of mind, *that* was not the question at all. It was what was the means on God's part. Bread and Priest were to be got rid of. This was to be done by ignoring the "given and eaten" of the Article. It was done for a purpose. Bread is denied to be a means in defiance of the "less full" Catechism. At any rate, as the question and answer are taken from two sources, why not say so manfully? Why? Because, having snubbed the Catechism as "less full," the authors were ashamed to own that they had resorted to it actually *because it was "less full,"* "given and eaten" being left out in order to make the question and answer "less full." The more the matter is sifted, the more disgraceful and Jesuitical the manipulation will appear.

EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.

◆

THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—Your fair correspondent, Mrs. Marshall, has challenged me to the combat. This is scarcely fair. What Irishman can strike at a lady? That is the reason that, in all rent frays, the ladies are put foremost. Gallantry forbids that our police or military should wound their delicate frames. But controversy with a lady is most repugnant to me—whether public or private. In this case the lady is a particular friend of mine, whose erudition and style of argument I have always admired. How am I to assail her? I would rather lay down my arms and throw myself at her feet. But she will not have it; I must stand up and show myself a man—I must obey, though my weapon is "*imbelle*," and I am "*impar congressus*," etc. She alone is answerable for the consequences.

2. Mrs. Marshall attacks your review of my pamphlet. That is your concern, and not mine.

3. She quotes me to the effect, "the Body of Christ, in some sense, is given to us with the bread." This is as the sun is present in my room or garden. "We," she says, "claim no more than this." *O si die omnia!* But I am denounced as a Virtualist, because I stand by Articles, Service, Catechism and Rubric. As to my allowing Puritans "any amount of latitude," as Mrs. Marshall says, what more could I do than state my own opinion in opposition to them?

4. What I meant by saying that the Ritualistic party used the weapons of the Rationalists against the Church is, that, as the Rationalists get rid of the bread, as a means, so the Ritualists do away with our formularies which stand in their way—Articles, Catechism, &c.

5. As to the Court of Arches and the Privy Council, I know that the first allowed Adoration, but the second would not condemn it, in Mr. Bennett's case, merely because he might mean only to adore our Lord's ever-present Deity.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—Will you allow me to quote an audacious sentence from a letter in this week's *Church Times?* "A Working Man" writes "our present apparent differences" with Rome "arise from the fact that several dogmas have been subsequently formulated by the 'Holy Roman Church,' which we, unfortunately, being in a state of estrangement from them have not given our consent to." Of course this "Working Man" refers to the Immaculate Conception and Personal Infallibility. If he is a fair specimen of "working men" in England, God help England; for rottenness has descended to the lower strata.

THE Council of the English Church Union announce that on the 24th ult. the sum of £9,639 3s. 4d. had been received in aid of their "Special Defence Fund." The most recent disbursements from the fund are:—£426 paid up to date on account of the Bell Cox case, and £84 in aid of Mr. R. F. Herring, Vicar of St. John Baptist's, Toxteth Park, Liverpool.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adamson, Rev. Arthur George, B.A., Diocesan Inspector of Schools; Rector of Aberedw-with-Llanfaredd, Radnorshire.

Archer, Rev. W. W., Curate of Thames Ditton; Vicar of Hampton Wick, Middlesex.

Beaven, Rev. Frederic H., Vicar of St. Chad's, Stafford; Vicar of St. Paul's, Burton-on-Trent.

Brodrick, Hon. and Rev. A., Honorary Canon of Winchester Cathedral, and Vicar of Godalming; Rector of Alverstoke.

Cardew, Rev. Frederick Campbell, M.A., Vicar of Torpoint, Cornwall.

Cardew, Rev. J. H., Rector of Winkfield, Wilts.

Catterall, Rev. Robert, Rector of St. Philip's, Bradford Road, Manchester; Missioner for the Diocese of Manchester.

Cole, Rev. George Edward, M.A., Rector of Exhall, Alcester; Rector of Barnborough, Doncaster.

Davies, Rev. David, B.A., Curate of Llanycil; Rector of Garthbeibio, Welshpool.

Fletcher, Rev. George Henry, Chaplain to the Manchester Prison; Chaplain to the Durham County Prison.

George, Rev. Alfred, Vicar of St. Barnabas's, Pendleton.

Gosse, Rev. Robert Wilkes, B.A., Vicar of Bratton St. Maur, Wincanton.

Gray, Rev. Charles, Vicar of St. Michael's, Northampton; Vicar of Belgrave-cum-Birstall, Leicester.

Groves, Rev. J., Rector of Middleton St. George, near Darlington; Vicar of Redcar, Yorkshire.

Hopkins, Rev. John, Curate of Llanarth, Cardiganshire; Rector of Llanllawer with Llanychllwyddog, Pembrokeshire.

Houghton, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Senior Curate of St. Paul's, Sheffield; Vicar of St. John's, Park, Sheffield.

Kempson, Rev. G. A. E., M.A., Rector of Rendcomb, Cirencester.

Longrigg, Rev. J. F., M.A,, Senior Curate of St. Paul's, Shipley; Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Leeds.

Milner, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of Caundle Stourton, Stalbridge.

Mugford, Rev. John Trounsell, B.A., Vicar of Lanteglos-by-Fowey, Cornwall.

Orr, Rev. A. B., Curate of Sedbergh; Vicar of Denby, Yorkshire.

Parson, Rev. John, Vicar of Talland, Cornwall.

Pearson, Rev. A. W., M.A., Rector of St. Margaret's, Canterbury; Rector of Halstead, Kent.

Rowlands, Rev. Lewis Thomas, Vicar of Llanddewi Brefi with Llanbadarn Odwyn, Cardiganshire; Surrogate for the Diocese of St. David's.

Smith, Rev. Sidney, M.A., Rector of Wheldrake, York.

Sparling, Rev. Albert Sidney Labouchère, Rector of Trevalga, Cornwall.

Spicer, Rev. Newton J., Rector of Wonston, Hants; Rector of East Woodhay, Newbury.

Townsend, Rev. J. H., Vicar of Hope-under-Dinmore, Hereford; Vicar of St. Mary's, Oatlands, Weybridge.

Welby, Rev. Montague Earle, M.A., late Rector of Gileston; to the consolidated Chapelry of St. John's, Cwmbach, Llechryd, Radnorshire.

Welch, Rev. F., Curate of St. Paul's Northwich; Colonia Chaplain, New Amsterdam. British Guiana.

Williams, Rev. Prebendary David, M.A., late Rector of Merthyr, Carmarthenshire; to the District Chapelry of Holy Trinity, Aberystwith.

Williams, Rev. David Payne, M.A., Vicar of Hillfarrence, Taunton.

Wilson, Rev. James, Perpetual Curate of East Hardwick.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barton, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Millom, at his vicarage, suddenly, on the 4th inst., in his 50th year.

Benthall, Rev. John, at Willen Vicarage, Newport Pagnell, aged 81.

Burne, Rev. Thomas, at Norbury Rectory, on the 29th ult., aged 63.

Downton, Rev. Henry Murray, Vicar of Hoxne, at York, on the 29th ult., aged 37.

Dyson, Rev. Francis, Vicar of Cricklade, on the 2nd inst., aged 68.

Guillemard, Rev. William Henry, D.D., late Vicar of St. Mary-the-Less, Cambridge, sometime Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and for twenty-one years Head Master of the Royal College, Armagh, at Waterbeach, on the 2nd inst., aged 71 years.

Knight, Rev. David Thomas, late of Earls Barton, where he was Vicar forty-two years, at Weston Favell, on the 1st inst., aged 78.

Maclure, Rev. Edward St. John, B.A., (Elect) of Keble College, Oxford, at the Vicarage, Rochdale, on the 2nd inst., aged 23.

Raynor, Rev. George Sydney, M.A., late Head Master of Kensington Foundation School, on the 1st inst., aged 34.

Stewart-Menteath, Rev. Granville W., formerly Vicar of Rauceby, youngest son of Sir C. G. Stuart-Menteath, of Closeburn and Mansfield, N.B., Baronet, at Ruskie, Leamington Spa, on the 1st inst., aged 76.

The Church of England Pulpit.

GOD'S FAITHFULNESS—MAN'S INGRATITUDE.

By the Rev. H. HARRIS DAVIES, M.A., Ph.D.,
Vicar of Llangoed, Anglesea.

A Harvest-Home Sermon, Preached in Llangoed Church on Sunday, September 4th, 1887.

"Neither say they in their heart, Let us now fear the Lord our God, that giveth rain, both the former and the latter in his season; He reserveth unto us the appointed weeks of the harvest."—Jeremiah v. 24.

IT appears from divers instances in their history, that the Jews, as a nation, turned away very reluctantly from their dumb idols to the true and the living God.

Though they had received, from time to time, innumerable proofs of His great and unceasing kindness to them, yet they refused to show Him any gratitude for his goodness in return, and they gave that tribute of praise and thanksgiving, which was due unto His divine Majesty, unto false gods—unto idols the work of their own hands!

And in consequence of this, the Almighty appeals to their common sense and to their conscience, with regard to His own worthiness, to be acknowledged as the Lord their God, and saith "Hear now this, O foolish people, and without understanding; which have eyes and see not, which have ears and hear not; Fear ye not me? saith the Lord, will ye not tremble at my presence, which have placed the sand for the bound of the sea by a perpetual decree, that it cannot pass it." The Jews lived at no great distance from the Mediterranean Sea, and as such, many of them might have had abundant opportunities to see it, when tempest-tossed, and when its mighty, roaring waves threatened to advance to cover the earth.

But the sand, though so small, bid it defiance, and said, "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no further."

The regular succession of the seasons of the year, though not so grand and stupendous in appearance, is, nevertheless, as indicative as the roaring sea, of the power of God, and of His superintendence over the world.

And it is to these seasons of the year that God calls the particular attention of the people of Israel in the text, and He bitterly complains that they had so incessantly received from His bountiful hands and yet refused to make Him any acknowledgment for His mercy and goodness. "The former and the latter rain" are frequently mentioned in the Old Testament. "The former rain" used to fall in the Eastern countries soon after the people had finished sowing their lands, and "the latter rain" again fell some time before the harvest. And it was upon the favourable quantity of rain which would be had at these two different times, that the quantity and the quality of the crops in the ensuing harvest depended. If the rain failed at any of the two periods mentioned, then the crops would be light, if indeed there would not be a complete failure.

And it appears from some of the following chapters, that the crops in some seasons had actually failed because there had been no rain, as well as on account of the raids or the incursions made by the enemy upon their land.

Here is what the prophet tells us upon the subject: "Because the ground is chapt, for there was no rain in the earth, the ploughmen were ashamed, they covered their heads. Yea, the hind also calved in the field, and forsook it because there was no grass." And it appears that the fear of the want of rain and of coming drought pressed deeply about this time upon the minds of the people of the land of Israel.

But contrary to their expectations, lo! God in His wrath remembered mercy; the heavens were darkened, the refreshing showers descended in great abundance upon hill and dale, to awaken the dormant seed, and to cover the earth with green grass. And we soon behold "the pastures clothed with flocks, the valleys covered with corn, and they shout for joy and also sing."

And because that God's own people refused to join the dumb creation to offer the tribute that was due unto His holy name, God bitterly complains in the text of their ingratitude and unconcern.

1. I shall observe that the regular succession of "the appointed weeks of the harvest" is a proof of the existence of God, and of His superintending care, and government of the world.

The abundant and the various provisions which God is pleased to make for the support and the happiness of man in this life, are infinitely beyond man's own power to supply. And all the care and the trouble which we take to dig and to properly prepare the ground for the reception of the different seeds, would be all in vain if the different seasons of the year did not also come round within the appointed time. For us to appoint and to try to regulate the different seasons of the year, would be so infinitely beyond our power to do, as if we attempted to create some great and beautiful world, as this appears to be.

No one can make rain, nor yet cause it to cease when it comes. No one can make the sun appear nor disappear, nor stop the wind to blow where and how it listeth. The power and the control of all these, as well as of everything else, are in the hands of Him who made them.

Had we been with God when He laid the foundations of the earth, we could have had no surer proofs of His existence, of His wisdom and power, than we do have in the perpetual succession of "the appointed weeks of the harvest." God in His infinite wisdom hath ordained the time and the duration of all these, that man might look forward for them, for without this he would not be able to know when to sow nor when to reap.

But as the different seasons of the year have been appointed, every man of common sense and experience knows when he should sow and plant, and when he can gather in that which was planted.

It is true the seasons of the year have very much altered, even within the recollection of some of us here; indeed they are so changed, that we are sometimes ready to grumble that every season in the year does not come up to our expectations.

But this arises from our ignorance, our peevish and dissatisfied disposition. For whether the different seasons of the year come and go with that wonted sameness or not, yet they, as well as everything else, come and go in perfection, as they have been ordered and made to revolve.

The seasons cannot in the least conceivable degree, be too early nor too late, too dry nor too wet, too cold nor too hot. "He hath also," saith the Psalmist, "stablished them for ever and ever, He hath made a decree which shall not pass." We recollect when we were young, we would naturally look forward for deep snow and hard frost always about Christmas. But we recollect also to have had such beautiful mild weather, sometimes, about Christmas, as if it had been the end of May instead of being the end of December. We also recollect the spring and the summer in some years continually showery and wet; and in other years, again, very dry, cold and windy. But the spring and summer this year have been exceptionally dry, windy and hot; and both man and beast have suffered in many places in consequence of the drought. But when we divest ourselves of prejudice and selfishness, and soberly reflect upon God's parental care and faithfulness to us, we are driven to acknowledge that He hath not forgotten nor withdrawn that ancient promise, which saith, "Seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease."

But though diversity exist between the different seasons, yet are they all regulated by the wisdom of God, to the greatest perfection. Thus God hath ordained that they should be, and therefore everything is in its proper place, and in its proper time.

Naturalists will tell us that dry, hot weather creates poisonous malaria, which is carried about in the air, and produces some fatal diseases, which take away thousands of our fellow-creatures every year. Now, the heavy rains and strong winds again, neutralise and dispel these noxious exhalations, and so prevent them from descending with their fatal effects upon man and beast.

And thus the wisdom of God is made manifest; if we are losers in one respect, that is by the lightness of the crops, we are great gainers in another respect; that is, our lives are spared. "The appointed weeks of the harvest" plainly show us the care and the goodness of God towards us. "Nevertheless," saith the Apostle, "He left not Himself without witness in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness."

When we find some great gentleman condescend to take interest in the sick, the poor, and the needy; when we find him feeding and clothing them, etc., we are drawn to admire and love him, we pray God to satisfy him with long life, and to pour down His choicest blessings upon him. But of all the benefactors that we ever had, or ever heard of, God is the greatest and the most impartial of all, for "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and He sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."

We are all recipients from the bountiful hands of God, and if we will only be good and dutiful children, we may rest assured that we shall never want anything that will be conducive to our final good. "For the Lord our God is a sun and a shield, the Lord will give grace and glory, and no good thing will He withhold from them that walk uprightly."

And here is another precious promise again: "Trust in the Lord and do good, so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed." When famine had overspread the land of Canaan, in the time of the patriarchs, there was abundance of corn in the store-houses of Egypt, and Joseph to superintend the sale of it. And when the grain crops happen to be not quite up to the mark in our own country, yet we need not fear famine, for there is always so far abundance of foreign grain in our markets, and that sold so cheap, that bread is, of all things, within the reach of the poorest in the land. And, therefore, instead of giving the reins to dissatisfaction and melancholy, let us bow to the will of heaven, and say, "O God, Thy will be done."

II. We observe that the different seasons of the year should teach us our ignorance in respect to the future. We expect to find every season of the year the same, and every season good, but they do not always come up to our expectations. We are sometimes disappointed in two ways; that is, we sometimes get more than we expected, and sometimes less. But in either case we all get infinitely more than we deserve.

Everyone knows that a certain amount of heat and cold, of rain and dryness, is required to cherish and to ripen the different fruits of the earth; but what the precise amount, or the precise quantity should be, no one can tell. But this, like everything else, is known unto God, who governs everything according to His own will and pleasure. And we can rest assured that we are never so perfectly safe as when we are under the care and protection of our heavenly Father.

If we will only endeavour to do our duty as becometh Christians, we need not be over-anxious about the future. Here is what our Lord Jesus Christ hath told us upon the subject: "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?"

Let me, therefore, my brethren, exhort each of you "to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

2. The succession of "the appointed weeks of the harvest" should urge us to wait upon God for all the blessings which we require. Man cannot interfere with the seasons in any way. It is God alone that can control them, and whilst it is our duty to do our best to prepare the ground, and to sow and to plant in time, yet all would be labour in vain unless it pleased God to crown our endeavours with His blessing.

The beautiful weather, the fructifying showers and the hot sun, are all at the command of the Creator of the world, as well as the roaring tempest, the destructive hail, the locust, and the canker-worm.

When God is pleased to bless, even Balaam cannot curse against His will. And on the other hand, again, when God thinks fit to curse, there is no one in heaven nor earth that can prevent Him, nor recall His curse, nor turn it to a blessing. For "He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay His hand, nor say unto Him, 'What doest Thou?'"

3. The coming of "the appointed weeks of the harvest" should also be unto us an occasion of joy and thankfulness. The people of Israel were strictly commanded to keep the feast of the harvest, and of the ingathering, and none of them were allowed to appear empty-handed before God.

And the same duty is also urged upon us, and when we thus assemble together in God's house, let us take care that our hearts be full of the deepest gratitude; yea, "Be thankful unto Him and speak good of His Name." For "He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and the herb for the service of man, that he may bring forth food out of the earth." "Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase, and God, even our God, shall bless us."

4. The coming of "the appointed weeks of the harvest" should teach us to lead a diligent, careful life.

"The sluggard," saith Solomon, "will not plough by reason of the cold; therefore shall he beg in harvest and have nothing."

The harvest fruits are the reward which God gives to the diligent for his labour and expense, and He generally gives good interest to every man. He gives to some an hundred-fold, to some sixty, and to some thirty. We ought to be very thankful that it is God that rewardeth and not we ourselves, or we would, perhaps, "Subvert a man in his cause"; that is, we would wrong him by our partiality and selfishness.

But "doth God pervert judgment? or doth the Almighty pervert justice?" No, but here is what He saith: "He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly, and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully."

True some people get more, and others less, of the good things of this world, but it is God that measureth to each one his portion, and therefore he cannot grumble, nor ask, "What dost thou?"

I would have you, my brethren, to whom God hath given so liberally, to bear in mind that it is your duty to deal out of your abundance to others, who are less fortunate, and remember also that, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

This world is like an immense chain, all is connected together with innumerable links. The system is that of reciprocity, of giving and taking, and so all depend upon one another, from the highest to the lowest in the land; and all without exception again depend upon God, who is the Author and Giver of all good.

And now, in conclusion, I would have you all to bear in mind that the last harvest-home appointed to us will soon come. Our years and seasons are, alas! drawing to an end, and they will soon be over!

Of all the countless millions of straws which we lately beheld, there is scarcely one of them now to be found on the lands. No. "The harvest is past now, and the summer is ended."

And so also of the countless millions of people that now inhabit the earth, not one of them will be seen much longer. The sharp sickle of death will soon cut them all down, and they will all disappear for ever!

And shall we at the end of this reaping be gathered together into the garner of heaven, like the pure, golden wheat; or shall we be bound up in bundles like worthless tares, and cast into the unquenchable fire?

May God grant that every dispensation, whether in mercy or in judgment, be the means to ripen and prepare us all for that better country in which there remaineth a rest to the people of God!

CONSCIENCE.

By Rev. JOHN LIGHTFOOT, M.A., D.Sc.

Sermon Preached in the Foundling Church, on Sunday, August 7th.

"Their conscience also bearing witness."—Romans ii. 15.

THE founder of modern critical philosophy said that two things filled his soul with awe, "the starry heaven above, and the moral law within." In these days the increasing knowledge of the universe in which we live has somewhat strangely diminished the feeling of awe and reverence which its contemplation years ago inspired. Why this should be is rather hard to say. When, as a matter of fact, every step in advance shows how closely related every fraction is to its neighbour, and how the whole is bound together with marvellous links, one would have thought that the result would have been quite in an opposite direction. But the difficulty receives at least a partial solution in the reflection that men are ever apt to mistake discrimination for explanation. Thus, for example, the simple faith of ancient days was accustomed to say of these mortal bodies of ours: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," and then to think with reverence of Him who could from such material build up the imperial personality of man. To-day we speak somewhat differently. Instead of writing "dust" as that of which all living things are created, we have been taught to speak of "protoplasm." And although if you have this "physical basis" given, you are yet no nearer the production of life, still it is true that all life, from that of the lowliest weed to that of the highest animal, is manifested in connection with, though not as the result of, this protoplasm. But what of this? Suppose it possible to identify all living things in this common element, and then to trace step by step the wondrous ascent of living organisms, now marking off this as plant and this as animal, this as vertebrate, this as invertebrate, and supposing we could see in each separate step the gradual transition of a lower into a higher form, what then have we really accomplished? In the scientific interest very much, in the practical sphere very much, but in the way of explanation little indeed. The complexity of the whole process thus brought to light has only furnished a vast amount of material in addition to the initial problem, also requiring solution. There is no doubt that the deep interest which the study of details and processes always creates, does to a large extent in ordinary men give rise to the mistake, that whilst the details are being enumerated the explanation is also being supplied. It is the peculiar function of what is called philosophy to recall men's thoughts from time to time to forgotten aspects of the many questions occupying their attention. Science in any of its special spheres is occupied with the phenomenal, with the world of appearances, philosophy reminds men of the permanent and real, underlying all. Science speaks of laws and forces, and builds its whole structure upon certain assumptions, the truth of which cannot be established by any demonstration. These laws and forces are spoken of in uncritical moments as though they were huge phantoms in the mid air. These assumptions are taken for granted as the most necessary truths. But this is all a matter of faith. It has sometimes been made a matter of reproach that the Scriptures have insisted so often and so earnestly, that the "just shall live and walk by faith." But it would appear upon closer investigation that not only do the just, but also the unjust—they, if they walk at all, must walk by faith. It is the function of philosophy again and again to point out how large an amount has been taken for granted in scientific conclusion. It asks, too, what is really meant by law and force? It is well to be reminded that we do not explain anything by merely giving it a name. It is because philosophy has been to a large extent neglected in England that the suspicion of an irreconcileable antagonism between science and religion has become confirmed in the minds of so many. And it would be happy, indeed, for our Church, and for Christianity generally, if some dawning of this might come into the minds of those in authority. Our institutions for the training of clergy, and the examination by which proficiency is tested, give evidence of abundance of learning with a minimum of thinking. Science is handing over year by year a vast amount of new material, the deeper meaning of which it is the work of the Church to unfold. But unmindful of her high mission in this respect, her officers are wasting their energies in controversies the most trivial. What wonder that thinking men treat our ministrations with contemptuous disdain, when they find the utmost ignorance of the most elementary details of the great problems of the day, or when they hear us slipping off names the most sacred, and truths the most profound, of which hardly one in a hundred of the trained ministry seem able to give any intelligible or critical account whatever.

But although for reasons such as these, the "starry heaven above," the world of nature around us, has lost somewhat of its importance as a means of leading men to God, yet even to-day the voice of conscience within, still asserts itself, bearing its unsolicited, indisputable testimony to the eternal distinctions between right and wrong, and to the existence of the moral governor from whom those distinctions flow. Apart from any question as to how man has come to be what he is, there is no manner of doubt that there is in all ordinary men the discrimination between actions right and wrong; there is in man the conviction that he ought to do this and not that, and there is a consciousness of merit or demerit according to the conformance or non-conformance of his actions with his standard of obligation. You know that all our thought is built upon certain simple root principles, which the mind recognises and accepts as true without knowing why or how they are. These simple truths, which lie at the root of all our logical or mathematical reasoning, are the foundation of all our intellectual life. These are given to us and we must accept them as they are. I do not mean that they are innate, that is, born with us. Men are not supplied with truths ready made, neither do they have given them a stock of sound conclusions to save them the trouble of arriving at such conclusions by personal endeavour. But these truths are such that on the presentation of a single experience involving any of them the mind recognises them as valid, not only in this case, but in all cases. Any argument which may occupy your mind, any induction in the scientific sphere, if persistently questioned and pushed back step by step, will ultimately reveal one or other of these elementary truths, for which no further reason can be given. Amongst these simple unresolvable truths we find some which have a special reference to the actions of man—they refer not to what a man may know, but to what a man should do. When in any given case we are asked *why* we call this right and that wrong, or in what does its rightness or wrongfulness consist, we can give no answer. We could no more dispute it than we could dispute that the parts are equal to the whole; we could no more say why the mind recognises it as right or wrong than we can say why it recognises at once that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. Now these first principles of morality are true for all men and at all times, they are the moral law of God—a law not, indeed, written upon tablets of stone, but upon the tablet of the heart. That faculty within man by which these simple elementary truths of morality are discovered is what is meant by conscience. When its still small voice is heard, we hear the very voice of the Eternal God. Its simple command is a "categorical imperative"; it makes no account of inclination or circumstance, but utters for all men and at all times alike: "Thou oughtest." If this be so, then with what unspeakable reverence should we listen to its words, what absolute obedience should we yield to its behest. If men did thus yield obedience, or if conscience could compel obedience, then, indeed we should have heaven begun on earth. But some one may be inclined to say: "Surely the question has more obscurity than the preacher seems to suggest, for to judge by the action of many apparently sincere men conscience in different men seems to sanction most contradictory practices. How can its supremacy on the one hand be reconciled with the diversity of moral judgments amongst men on the other. Must it be said of that which is intended by God to be the guide of life, that it is untrustworthy or weak, and that some higher teaching is necessary, some further guidance to ensure this one speaking aright. Perplexity here is oftentimes deepened by popular language, which speaks of an educated or an ignorant conscience, a perverted, a hardened, or enlightened conscience, and so on, so that it would appear as though, after all, God's gift of guidance to man still requires guidance and light from elsewhere before it can be of practical service to the soul of the individual.

I need not point out to you how this confusion has led to numerous errors, and how, especially, it has been made the support of ecclesiastical usurpations. How, for example, men have been taught to mistrust their own conscience, and to give themselves over to the spiritual guidance of others. However excellent this may be in rare exceptional spiritual diseases, such as our Prayer-book contemplates in its directions concerning private confession, there is no doubt that for a man or woman of ordinary power and capacity such practice is dangerous to them intellectually and morally, as it is dishonouring to God. Now, in order to avoid confusion here, we need carefully to distinguish two things—the knowledge or perception of moral law, and the translation of these, or rather their application, by an act of judgment, to the details of daily life. In popular language, we call any conviction which is honestly entertained a conscientious conviction, but no one would care to assert that every conviction honestly entertained is infallibly right. Yet, on the other hand, we cannot suppose it possible for conscience to err without obviously surrendering its claim to be the Divine gift for the guidance of conduct. To say that all men are obeying the voice of conscience whilst pursuing the most opposing lines of conduct, simply because certain opinions are honestly entertained, is to rob conscience of all value whatever. In this case there would be no fixed principles of morality, and for "every man to do that which is right in his own eyes" is conduct not to be condemned, but rather approved. But surely I need not say to you how, from Socrates in the ancient world to Emmanuel Kant in the modern world, the best thought of mankind has rejected such a conception as this, and how, with marvellous unanimity, it has re-echoed the words of the Divine Lord, who said: "Heaven and earth may pass away, but My word shall not pass away."

And, as a matter of fact, even when we compare the most widely conflicting judgments of men we do find a very general agreement upon matters of right and wrong. Take the elementary forms of rectitude, such as truthfulness or justice; you never find these reversed. No nation has ever placed these in the category of moral evil. It is quite true that they have excused deceit, but that does not lead them to condemn integrity. Wherever diversity of judgment exists on moral questions, it is almost invariably concerned with the determination of what is wrong, and never in the deciding as to what is right. And this at once makes clear to us where mistake may be possible. It is in the application of the unvarying principles of morality revealed by conscience to the details of life that men go astray. In no department of our mental life can you compel a man to judge correctly by telling him that he ought. In mathematics and in science, amid the processes of reasoning required, error slips in again and again, and men are constantly obliged to give up cherished opinions when the mistake is discovered. Nor is it otherwise in matters of morality. Men who will judge lazily, or act without judgment at all, accepting mere current opinion, or following the impulse born of acquired habit, are pretty sure to act wrongly. For not only is there a possibility of wrongful judgment, but when we bear in mind how much malice and hatred, how much selfishness has found its way into these natures of ours, and how prone we are to consider that as right which we are most inclined to do, then we have to say that not only is there possibility, but strong probability that mistaken judgments will be made. And when once they are made, their progress in the wrong direction becomes fatally rapid. For what a man, correctly or incorrectly, judges to be right, he will experience self-approbation in doing, and, on the other hand, shame and remorse in doing that which he has disapproved. The existence of such sentiments as shame and remorse, or even the sense of well-doing, are not, therefore, any final evidence as to the goodness or badness of an action. In short, religion, from the simple distinctions of right and wrong to the highest act of worship, does not found upon such a transitory changing basis as feelings or sentiments. Whatever else it is, religion must always be man's *reasonable* service. From this we shall easily perceive the necessity of moral education and its special sphere. The old Greeks were accustomed to hold two apparently contradictory propositions. That virtue cannot be taught, and that virtue must be taught. Virtue, in the sense of the eternal distinctions between right and wrong, needs not to be taught. These flow from the nature of the Almighty, and are given to us, not made by us. Virtue, in the sense of personal attainment, personal subjection to the law which conscience reveals, this we can and must teach.

But, when education has done its work, when false sentiment has been exposed, when man has put aside all mere opinions and recognises the duty of submission to the pure law revealed within, what shall we say then? Is it enough to know what we ought to do in order that we may straightway be able to perform the same? Perhaps it was so with man at the first, perhaps it was so with us years ago. But how is it with us now? Conscience presents the naked law to the soul, but lo! the will is enfeebled, and is powerless to carry it into practice. We can echo the language of the great Apostle in this very Epistle, when he tells us how, with his better self he recognises and consents to the law which is holy and just and good; whilst another law has become established in his lower self, warring against the other, and bringing it into captivity, so that the evil he disapproves that he does, and the good he would that he cannot do. Habit has become a second and a stronger nature; how shall its chains be broken? The affections have become depraved so that I do not and I cannot love that which I would. We, too, when we have thought what we might have been, as contrasted with what we are, we, too, could cry: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

In such an hour of helplessness and, maybe, despair, may God give you grace to turn to the old, simple Gospel of the Lord Jesus. In Him, the Crucified Redeemer, salvation is only to be found. God in Christ not only freely forgives our transgression, but, better than this, He gives us life and strength. The law says, "This do and thou shalt enter into life." It says to you day by day, "Keep innocency and do the thing which is right, for that shall bring you peace at the last." But Jesus gives us what the law could not—He gives us power wherein we are weak, deliverance to the captive, life to the dead. And which of us needs not this power, this deliverance. As you feel your need, so bow more humbly at the foot of the Cross. His strength is perfected in our weakness. Failure in the past may thus be a blessing if it leads you to sing with deeper earnestness:—

I could not do without Thee,
  I cannot stand alone;
I have no strength or goodness,
  No wisdom of my own.
But Thou, beloved Saviour,
  Art all in all to me,
And perfect strength in weakness
  Is theirs who lean on Thee.

THE Lord Mayor has presented to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's Cathedral forty large Prayer-books, bound in morocco and gold, for the Bishop's, Dean's, Canons', and Prebendal stalls, in commemoration of the Jubilee Thanksgiving Service, held there on June 23rd last. Each book is stamped with the arms of the Cathedral and a suitable inscription.

CONSIDERABLE improvements have been lately made to the Church of St. Edmund King and Martyr, in Lombard Street. The old stone steps which disfigured the chancel have been removed, and replaced with steps of white marble, and the floor has been re-laid with black and white marble tiles. The work has been carried out by Messrs. Arthur Lee and Brothers of Bristol.

A TEST OF CHRISTIAN LIFE.

By the Rev. H. THOMPSON, B.A., Vicar of Aldeburgh, Suffolk.

Sermon Preached at Aldeburgh, on Sunday Evening, August 28th, 1887.

"As it is fit in the Lord."—Col. iii. 18.

THESE words come from the "short lesson" addressed to wives by St. Paul in this Epistle. The companion Epistle to the Ephesians contains a longer lesson to them; and there we learn a special reason why Christian wives should submit themselves to their husbands. Yes, we learn that they should do so because the Christian wife (1) plays a part in a parable. As a husband is the head of the wife, so is Christ the head of the Church. If, therefore, the wife is not subject to her husband, she fails to set forth to the world the subjection of the Church to Christ. But here a general reason only is given, which applies equally to the duties of every relation in which the Christian can stand. The Christian wife (2) is a servant of Christ. Marriage is one of His ordinances; He requires submission on the wife's part; His honour is therefore concerned in her obedience to this requirement. And so we get a general principle; whatever the Christian does in word or deed should be settled by the consideration of what is becoming on the part of one who is "in the Lord."

1. We ask, then, what it is to be "in the Lord"? Most distinctly there is such a condition recognised in the New Testament. Churches are "in Christ" (Gal. i. 22), and so are individuals (Rom. xvi. 7). There can be no doubt what it meant; it meant to belong to the Church, to have believed and to have been baptised, baptised into Jesus Christ. (St. Mark xvi. 16, Rom. vi. 3, Gal. iii. 27). The distinction would be a sharper one then than now between those in the Lord and those who were not so. And this for two reasons. First, because the man "in the Lord" would cease to be an idolator, while all others would remain such. Then because in those early days there was no "unconscious Christianity." There had not been time for Christianity to leaven all classes of society as now. By our day it has done such good in the correction of national sins and social vices, and such good in the elevation to esteem of what is really virtuous, that multitudes are indebted to its influence who will not profess it. Many an unbeliever is an unconscious debtor to its influence, and consequently the contrast between his character and that of the believer by his side is less sharp than it used to be. Such are the indirect blessings which Christ has conferred on the world.* But, though the distinction has for these reasons lost some of its sharpness, it is a real, an all-important distinction still. And two things about the Apostle's use of it call for remark. (1) He makes no proposal anywhere to withhold it from any believer. He knew nothing of this modern fashion of judging between members of Christ as "a Christian" or "not a Christian." To their own Master they stood or fell, not to him. We forget how the servants were met who wished to take upon themselves the task of rooting up the tares; it is not for the servants, nor ever will be. It is a hurtful habit for those who indulge it, breeding a self-righteous spirit and inducing a gloomy view of the Church. It makes a bad impression on the world that we should sit in judgment on one another. And happily! our judgment is often wrong. While we say this, we recognise to the full the sad fact that many do not walk worthy of their profession, but we must judge ourselves and not them. Also (2) the Apostle by his frequent use of the expression, calls attention to the strength of it. For what an expression it is! I believe in Julius Cæsar as an historical person, but I am not therefore "in" him. I believe in the teaching of Bacon's "Advancement of Learning," but you would not say I am "in" him to express that. The Israelites were even "baptised into" Moses in the Red Sea, devoted to follow him, but they are never said to be "in Moses." Here is the closest union. The stone is firmly joined to the building; the branch yet more to the tree, for there is in-flowing life; but the Christian is joined as these are, and more, as the limb to the living head. If he does not act "as it is fit in the Lord," he does dishonour to the one body.

2. Again we ask what befits this condition, of being "in the Lord"? It is to remind you of the answer that the text was chosen. The Christian faith claims the life of those who embrace it. Here, and here only, morality and religion, holiness and faith, are tied together. Let us justify this assertion. Two chief teachers have asked the ear of mankind, but they have not taught men godliness. (1) There are the heathen faiths. Look back upon them to see what they have done in the past, look round upon them and ask what they are doing in the present. Have they given men worthy ideas of God, made them merciful, taught them purity? The answer must be that they have made gods lower than themselves, deified their passions, filled the earth with the habitations of cruelty, practised things in secret which are not to be named among Christians. The Hindoo will do his worship, but it never enters his mind that it has any connection with his manner of life. (2.) Some will refer us to heathen philosophy as a more just representation of heathenism, and as making higher claims. But does it rise to the claim of which we speak? Far from it. Were the professors themselves examples

---

* See Farrar's "Life of Christ," ii. 420-422. Also "St. Hilary," (for English Readers), pp. 34-5. (S.P.C.K.)

of virtue? The defect of it was abundantly confessed by the heathen.* Did they influence the masses for good? They did not address the masses at all, but despised them and left them to their own ways. Did they supply even their own disciples with a practical guide. The answer has been given that philosophy "was a school of opinions, not a discipline of life." But that which heathen faiths and philosophy have failed to do, Christ has done and does. He restores in man the nature from which he fell. No words can express this as inspired words can: "Who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto Himself a peculiar people zealous of good works."

Let us never abate one jot of this distinctive claim and power of Christianity. He ceases to be Christian who is not Christian in life. We may not teach one thing and do another. Our morality is based on our religion. Christian in deed, or not Christian at all. Let us never give occasion to men to deny this connection. The life in general should be submitted to the guidance of the Spirit of Christ. The duties of the relations in which we stand should be done the more because we are the Lord's. And details should be settled by the question, what is "fit in the Lord." For there is of course a "world." And alas! there are inconsistent unworthy Christians. "Tell me," some are saying, "how to be religious. Mine is an ordinary humdrum life; how can I live it as a Christian?" Chemists and founders use a pot of tempered earth in which to melt the ores of metal, and the metal drops below free from the dross, tried by the fire. Our text is a crucible. The question comes up, "Shall I act in a certain way?" Cast it into the crucible. Is that course, or is it not, "fit in the Lord?"

◆

THE *Yorkshire Post* states that Mr. Jolly, who has been for seventeen years pastor of the Baptist Chapel, Boston, has seceded from that body, and is now a candidate for ordination by the Bishop of Ripon. The Baptists were a very influential body in Boston until recently, but in consequence of disputes between the pastor and the deacons there has been a great falling off in the attendance at the chapel. A short time ago Mr. Jolly tendered his resignation, after which the triennial election of deacons returned a majority of staunch supporters of the pastor, who pressed him to withdraw his resignation. Mr. Jolly, before setting out on his holiday tour, promised to send an answer to the request. Nothing further was heard from him direct, but the application for ordination is a sufficient answer. Some of his admirers have determined to present him with a testimonial of their regard. Mr. Jolly has been the leading Nonconformist minister of the district, and his secession has created quite a sensation in South Lincolnshire.

RHEUMATISM, GOUT,
SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, INDIGESTION, CONSTIPATION, LIVER & KIDNEY COMPLAINTS, NERVOUS DISORDERS, LADIES' AILMENTS, ETC. Promptly Relieved and CURED BY
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT
ALL sufferers should read "Harness' Guide to Health," free by post, containing copies of **Thousands of Testimonials.** Every man and woman in search of **Health, Strength, and Energy,** should at once send a **21s.** postal order to the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd. 52, OXFORD ST.** LONDON, W. and procure one of these famous Belts, and they may rely upon being CURED
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1887.

THE LATEST FACTS ON IRISH MATTERS

VERY interesting are the published statistics bearing on the amount of deposits in Irish joint stock, and post-office, and trustee savings banks. The result is that during the years in which Ireland is represented as having been crushed by the weight of agricultural depression, we find the people have been accumulating larger balances at the banks. There are more banks in Ireland throughout the country than the ordinary British tourist imagines. The competition between them has been, in fact, terrific, and the result has been a marvellous extension of banking facilities everywhere. The tenant farmer has fully availed himself of these facilities, as the statistics show, and his deposits have increased, notwithstanding a larger expenditure upon luxuries and semi-luxuries. Last year England reduced her consumption of spirits by 4·09 per cent., and Scotland 2·71. Ireland, however—poor, poverty-stricken Ireland—*increased* her consumption of duty-paid spirits by 4·43 per cent. Illicit distillation, also, was considerably extended, so that these figures do not give an accurate measure of the increase of consumption. But there are other evidences that Ireland is by no means in such an exceptional state of distress or poverty as unprincipled agitators try to make out. The Commissioners of Customs, in their recent report, say that "notwithstanding the long-continued political and agrarian agitation in Ireland, and the steady diminution of her population, the trade in articles liable to Customs duty shows no diminution. On the contrary, the receipt for the past fiscal year is the largest of any of the ten years commencing 1877-8, in which year it formed 9·66 per cent. of the entire Customs revenue of the United Kingdom, whilst in the past year it constituted 10·26 per cent., and this notwithstanding the fact that the duty on tea is taken in increasing amount in London, whence it is removed duty paid." It is almost impossible to reconcile these undoubted facts and figures with the theory of increasing poverty. The population have not only increased their savings in the banks, but they have augmented their expenditure on indulgencies. Add to this that rent is an ever diminishing quantity, and that the Irish tenants have greater security and more privileges than any occupier on the face of the globe, and it will readily be seen that a vast amount of the talk in Parliament and on the platform about Irish poverty is mere clap-trap. Such facts as we have just stated are never met by Irish or English Home Rulers. They hate all figures except figures of speech, and rely entirely upon sentiment for the furtherance of their plan of campaign against the British elector. We shall hear very little during the next few weeks of prosaic facts. The big drum of agitation is being beaten in Clare and elsewhere too loudly to allow of any sober consideration upon the real condition of Ireland; and Mr. Philip Stanhope will doubtless return home from his recent visit to Ireland laden with new tales for the insatiable maw of Mr. Schnadhorst's scribes. But, Mr. Dillon notwithstanding, there is yet some chance of the Irish land question being discussed by representative men from the two classes who are now the joint owners of the land of Ireland. Archbishop Walsh has held out a kind of an olive-branch through a letter to the Irish landlords, and at present the Irish press is discussing under what conditions it would be possible to conduct a Round Table Conference which might ultimately lead to some compromise between the two contending parties. If Irishmen could lay aside their class hatred and religious hostilities for a brief space, and try and clear the ground for an amicable settlement of the land question it would be a great boon to Englishmen. But the difficulties are almost insuperable. The landlords have been hard hit, no doubt, not only in purse but in pride. For seven long years they have been the object of the basest misrepresentation and abuse, and Mr. Healy's vocabulary is not likely to increase the chances of a forget-and-forgive policy. When a man is not only abused, but his pocket suffers by the bad language of his adversary, he is apt to become restive and eager for reprisals, and this is only natural. But if the landowners are doubtful of making an experiment which failed in England between statesmen of the same party and of the first order, is it likely that the tenants will consider themselves in any way bound hereafter by a course which is already being denounced by Mr. Dillon and Mr. William O'Brien? No conference can be expected to succeed in Ireland under such conditions as at present exist, and we greatly fear that there is little chance of the idea being carried out even to a preliminary discussion. Archbishop Walsh may be in earnest over the matter, but he will have a difficult task to carry such a conference through if he attempted it single-handed. There are indications already that there is a section of the Nationalists who will not tolerate the dictation even of an archbishop, and Mr. Davitt's connection with Mr. Henry George and the excommunicated Father McGlynn leads us to believe that he would be the first to repudiate any conference on the Land Question based on concessions of justice and equity to the landowners. The fact is that Ireland is in a state of civil war. The events of the past week at Mitchelstown and Lisdoonvarna sufficiently prove this, and it is, therefore, almost idle in such a terrible state of social disorganisation to expect that parties contending, as they do in Ireland, with unexampled rancour, can ever be expected to sit down and settle the lines of a compromise on the question of this grave and complex problem. The landowners naturally rest their case on the responsibility of the British Government for the present state of the land market in Ireland, and object strongly to being purchased out without compensation when the value of land has been unduly depreciated by a political conspiracy for ulterior objects. The tenants point to foreign competition, the fall in prices, and the decisions of the Land Courts as proofs of the great depression in agriculture. All other facts and figures, such as those we have put forward at the outset of these remarks, are entirely ignored and deemed unworthy of consideration. And so the game of bluff goes on. The British public, however, must soon take a real and responsible interest in the question, as upon it hinges the whole future government of Ireland. Settle the land question equitably as between landlord and tenant, and the Home Rule question is nearly solved. This is the central fact of the situation, and the British elector should make up his mind either to make some sacrifices to accomplish it or, as we have often advised, he should insist upon perfecting the union between the two countries, by abolishing the political Vice-Royalty, by amalgamating the Peerage, the Privy Councils, the Home Offices, the Judicatures, the Bars, the Law Offices, the National Banks, and, we should say, the Episcopal Churches of the two countries. If this were done, we believe that Englishmen, English enterprise and capital would flow into Ireland, where abundant and cheap labour is to be had. Inasmuch as the Irish are industrious and prosperous in every other land, we cannot but believe that under proper initiation and direction they would be so in their own beautiful island.

---

* "Defenders of the Faith," pp. 91-3. (S.P.C.K.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

IS PREVENTION ALWAYS BETTER THAN CURE?

SIR,—I beg to submit some remarks made by me last January, in reply to an intelligent man, who has since gone to the Antipodes. He was favourably disposed to the belief that moral good will completely vanquish all evil. But the inquiry naturally presented itself to him, as it has to many: "If sin is to be stopped ultimately by Divine interference, why not prevent it at the beginning?"

I submitted the following considerations to him, and he seemed to regard them with acquiescence:—

The methods employed by the Creator in the organisation of the physical Universe, may fairly be supposed to suggest, if not to indicate, the processes He deems most fitting for the education of the intelligence He brings into existence. I presume before order was evolved, there was an anarchic and chaotic appearance in physical elements, during periods so lengthened, that they are beyond our faculties of imagination. We ought, therefore, not to be impatient, if the processes in relation to intellectual and moral life present similar features.

So far as my imperfect faculties are able to rise at all towards the sublime topic, it seems impossible for created intelligences to be so much separated from the Creator, in whom they live and move and have their being, as to acquire real freedom. Locke said, "I see not the way of it." My conjecture is, that our spiritual essences "have an affinity to God, and must ultimately return to God," as Gregory of Nyssa thought. This I understand to mean that the germ of the Divine likeness is in every spiritual essence, always there, and capable of being developed, but never lost. "God created man in His own image"; but that image has never yet been exhibited except in One Man.

I can form no conception of a spiritual essence, but from what I feel and see, I suppose it is progressively trained by being connected with physical organisations, which coerce it, with gradually relaxing force, as the spirit exerts increasing degrees of control. I say *coerce*, as it seems clear that our thoughts and emotions depend very much on the cerebral organs and nervous system. Those we obtain through the law of heredity, which elevates and degrades in accordance with sternly instructive rules of discipline. I do not believe in free will, as generally defined, nor in a probation having irreversible results. The object of the Creator is not to decide at the close of a human life whether the individual is to be consigned or abandoned to irremedial depravity and misery. It is His purpose, which I affirm is clearly declared in the Sacred Volume, to train every intelligent being brought into existence for a safe, happy, and holy immortality. It would not be difficult to make every creature act right, even as bees and ants. The difficulty is, to implant, develop, and establish intelligent freedom, to be wisely guided by the individual mind. In order to accomplish this, ignorant and inexperienced creatures must be exposed to darkness, uncertainty, conflicting impulses, much risk and suffering, with occult guidance and support sparingly administered.

In this life, I take it, we are greatly coerced, impelled, and impeded by our physical organisation; possibly our spirits commenced their training in forms of animal life, lower than the human, and they are our relations in a sense suspected by few. After this life, the condition of all will undergo changes, which I think the analogies in our earthly experience do not enable us to realise. Some will rise to far higher degrees of knowledge and conformity to the Divine image. Probably the largest number, who apparently leave the earth, without even acquiring the rudiments of mental and moral knowledge must be placed on what may be called the lowest forms of intelligent instruction. Another large proportion of lives terminate with the weight and stains of vice and crime pressing down the sinking spirit, and with claims of retribution and vengeance sternly crying against it. A greater number than the last move on towards the sepulchre, swayed by indolent, if not malevolent, selfishness, and hardly conscious that any class of serious realities calls for their attention. Only a fraction of the whole, so far as can be seen, are impressed with the belief that this life is of the most solemn importance in connection with our immortal existence.

I find in the sacred volume the most appalling declarations concerning the sufferings and punishments in a future life. But I also find consolatory assurance that the Father will, through Christ, reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross; also that the creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

The counteractive measures are of a nature so marvellous, that a finite mind could not have foreseen them, or even conceived their possibility. The scheme of redemption presents such manifestations of Divine love and self-sacrifice, and such boundless resources of spiritual influence for illumination, correction and transformation, that all intelligent beings, when they understand the subject, must be overpoweringly impressed by grateful amazement and loving admiration. Christ, who has been lifted up in the sight of the Universe, with an exhibition of tender self-abnegation, as yet perhaps appreciated by few on earth, will draw *all* men unto him.

J. B.

Canonbury, September 10th, 1887.

◆

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND'S CATECHISM.

SIR,—Your correspondent "Even Handed Justice," says in his letter in to-day's paper several things that he says he said before, none of which are to the purpose of his accusation against the Preface of the Church of Ireland Common Prayer Book, viz.: "there stands in our new preface an absolute falsehood." Your readers will observe, if they are interested in this matter, that your correspondent abstains from repeating this piece of impudence; which piece of impudence I showed in my letter printed on this day week to be without any foundation.

The design of the Report of Master Brooke's Committee may have been what your correspondent states; and its authors may have been a set of Jesuits. What its design was or was not has nothing to do with the question. Is your correspondent's accusation against the Preface true! Being a false witness in the one case, he is as likely as not to be the same in the other case.

For the satisfaction of such of your readers as may be interested in this matter, I repeat my exposure of the falsehood of the accusation. The Preface says: "in this behalf we have made no other change than to add to the catechism one question, with an answer taken out of the Twenty-eighth of the said Articles." Your correspondent reasons (if such can be called reasoning) as if this sentence contains a falsehood, because the answer, but not the question, is taken from the 28th Article; which is the very thing that the sentence says.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

September 10th, 1887.

◆

THE LATE REV. JOHN NASH GRIFFIN, D.D.

SIR,—The above-named eminent divine was known in England and Ireland as a scholar, a pulpit and platform orator. Possessing grace and elegance seldom equalled, still more rarely surpassed. In Harold's Cross, Dublin, and St. Mary's, Spring Grove, Middlesex, admiring hundreds eagerly hung on his glowing and burning words. In both places his ministry was a grand and a great success. It is only a very few years since he passed away at Blackheath, near London. And great has been the suspense to see, could his valuable sermons be collected and added to the theological literature of the day? I hear his widow possesses the manuscripts. If persuaded to sell the copyright, I have no doubt (and a great many are of my opinion), the sale of them would be astonishing. Will any of your influential readers inform me, is there any chance of this boon being given, as I fain too would be a subscriber to the works.

ENLIGHTEN ME.

◆

THE MINOR INCUMBENTS OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

SIR,—I have read the letter on the above subject from "An Indignant Looker-On," in a former issue. Permit me to ask through the pages of your influential paper, Is England fully aware of all the injustice done to the Irish incumbents by the Act of Disestablishment? If so, what action is proposed for those innocent but long-tried sufferers? As a class, they are men of no private means. The Church and parish take up all their time and engross all their thoughts, for all this a graceful and grateful lay-element, upon whose tender mercies they have been recklessly cast, only awards £200. To educate their children they must be shabby and starve, or else if they do neither, but keep a respectable outside, their children must do without education; the income will not do both. If unmarried men, or men without children, yet they may have mothers or sisters, or near relatives depending entirely on them for support. What can they do for their own comfort or support where this is so?

Will it surprise your English readers to hear in these troublous times in the sister isle, many of those God-fearing, well-informed, devoted, long-experienced men have to deny themselves many home comforts. Butter, meat, fire, etc., must be rarities in the long and hard and depressing struggle to keep out of debt. I know wealthy men in Ireland who waste hundreds a year on themselves their appetites, their sins, who think it a great act of goodness to give £5 or £10 a year to their poor minister's assessment. I know wealthy farmers who drink and smoke more in one six months than they ever gave to God, their minister, or their Church in their whole lives; who would say they were bankrupt if you told them they ought to do more than give five shillings or ten shillings per annum for their clergy. We see pretty clearly how the maker of the iniquitous Church Act lives; we have yet to see how he will die! What anguish of heart and mind he has been the cause of, what premature graves has his Act opened. How many pious, loyal, and true hearts have been broken and sunk therein, the day only shall declare.

God Almighty! Let the painful cry of anguish from long-tried but patient sufferers be wafted from the West to the East. And if it speedily finds an echo and a response in the heart of our beloved Queen and her Government, a change will appear.

JOB.

[We are not able to print other letters on this subject, but advise that a fund be started for the relief of these clergy.—ED.]

◆

MR. GURNEY'S SERMON.

SIR,—Kindly allow me space to correct an error in a note to Mr. Gurney's sermon in your number of the 3rd inst., that makes me say, "Expand the *first*"; it should be, "Expand the *finite* as you will, and it still falls infinitely short of infinity." May I add, that the second edition is already out of print. I am sorry that the third edition cannot appear till early next year (in a greatly enlarged form).

AUTHOR OF "UNIVERSALISM ASSERTED."

◆

MORE DIFFICULTIES OF A LITERAL TRANSLATION.—LETTER III.

SIR,—We have often asked those who maintain that the words, "This is my Body," must be taken literally, to explain them, with what follows: "Body, which is broken; Blood, which is shed." We have shown them that a dead body does not now exist, so that the bread cannot be changed into what has no existence, whilst of His living glorified Body, now alone existing, He spake nothing. But, to all this, we get no answer. It is a miracle, a mystery—very well! But the words cannot be taken literally, mystery or not. Then I have two more difficulties. In John iii. 13 our Lord says: "The Son of Man, which is in Heaven." Is this literally true? Was the Son of Man *then* in Heaven? His omnipresent Deity was, but not His manhood. So when He says, "This is my Body," He must speak of a Divine omnipresence, which is reconcilable with His Body being locally in Heaven alone. Again, look at John vi. 62, 'What, and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up, where he was before?" Is this to be taken as if the human Body, which was to ascend, had been in Heaven before? Impossible! Where the Deity was before, thither the humanity was to transfer itself. It is easy to say, Keep to the words of Scripture! No figurative interpretation! But this rule must be taken all round; and, when so taken, it utterly fails. It is we, who take Scripture in a sense which alone does not contradict those senses which God has given us, as a means whereby we can assure ourselves of the truths of Revelation. I have said over and over again that we are assured of the Resurrection, the foundation of our whole faith, by the testimony of the Apostles' senses. But it is said, you cannot trust your senses! Well, then, neither can we trust the senses of the Apostles. But as on them depends all proof of the Resurrection, we have no proof of that. It may be all a myth! Of what use are our eyes to read the Gospel, or the explanations of the Church; of what use are our ears to hear the voice of the speaking Church? If our senses fail, we have no way of learning anything from God, but by immediate revelation to every man individually. Let Scripture be taken as a whole, and then there will be no difficulty, for God is able, from our Lord's Body in Heaven, to supply all the grace we need. Thus His Body may be present to us on earth now, as it was in Heaven, when it stood on earth alone. Thus it may be present to us on earth, as His Deity was in Heaven from all eternity. Literal interpretation indeed! How can His Body slain be here when it is nowhere? How could His Body be in Heaven locally when it was on earth alone? How could it have been in Heaven locally, before it was born on earth? If people cannot explain these things, let them cease to call us heretics, because we maintain that the only real Presence is one of spirit and grace. This alone is what our forms teach. This alone is reconcilable to Scripture, as well as to our senses, mental and bodily, which God has given us to guide us in the only course which leads us to the haven where we would be.

Look again at the quibbling of Rome as to 1 Cor. xi. 24: κλώμενον, she translates in Vulgate as future, *tradetur;* and in the Douay, "which shall be given." But Wiseman sets this at nought, and translates it, p. 189, "which is broken for you." Why does he do this? Because he says it does not refer to our Lord's Body, but merely to the bread. At p. 269, we read, "the epithets apply not to the *future* state of Christ's body in the passion," though to make them do so, the Vulgate and the Douay actually translate the present participle as if it were future. "Not to the future state of Christ's body in the passion, but to the thing then before the Apostles." Thus the literal meaning is given up, and "this is my Body given or broken for you," is figurative, and means only the bread; this is in the face of all older versions and glosses. So much for Roman Unity. And yet, after all this, he flies round and says, at p. 270, that τοῦτο does not mean this bread, but this thing: "the thing so broken and given could not be the bread, because the expression 'for you,' ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν could not be used for it, but only of Christ, who was alone our redemption." Did ever weathercock fly round like this? I will add one word, on a point touched on in a former letter. It is said that our Lord worked the miracle of the loaves, in order to introduce the doctrine of a corporal presence. But, on the contrary, I say it was the seeking of the people after the mere carnal food, which led him to speak of the true bread, which cometh down from Heaven. Whether He spake merely of our faith resting on Him, or also of our being fed in the Holy Eucharist, is a matter which may be left an open question.

It is remarkable that the Vulgate gives the future tense for the present participle ἐκχυνόμενον in Matthew, Mark and Luke, though it translates διδόμενον in Luke xxii. 19, by the present tense *datur;* and yet, in 1 Cor. xi. 24, it has *tradetur.* So inconsistent it is, and regardless of tenses! It certainly looks very ill for any system, when it has to run a muck through tenses, in order to make out a tolerable case for itself.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.G. of Kildare.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Ainslie, Rev. Richard Montague, Senior Curate of Witton, Northwich; Perpetual Curate of St. Saviour's, Faulkne Square, Liverpool.

Barrett, Rev. Tufnell S., Rector of Teversal, Notts.

Burnet, Rev. William, Vicar of Crimplesham-with-Stradset near Downham Market, Norfolk; Chaplain of the Englis Church at Lille.

Bush, Rev. T. C., Vicar of Queen Camel, Somerset.

Cooper, Rev. William Henry Hewlett, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Bradenstoke-with-Clack, Wilts.

Deacon, Rev. A. W. N., Incumbent of Milton, Oxon; Rector of St. Mary's, Wallingford, Berks.

Duke, Rev. Rashleigh Edward Hungerford, Curate; Vicar of Monk Fryston.

Fewtrell, Rev. Edgar Alford, Curate of St. Paul's, Little Marsden; Incumbent of St. Thomas's, New Hey, Rochdale.

Gibbon, Rev. W. W., Canon of Ripon; Rector of King's Worthy, Hampshire.

Gristock, Rev. Alfred G., M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Hereford; Vicar of St. John's, Upper Holloway.

Hill, Rev. Charles Harwood, Curate of Middleton; Vicar of All Saints', Rhodes, Manchester.

Humphreys, Rev. Alfred Edward, M.A., Vicar of Hempton.

Lilly, Rev. C. B., Senior Curate of Clifton Parish Church; Vicar of Emmanuel Church, William Street, Kennington Road.

Owen, Rev. T. M. N., Vicar of All Saints', Rhodes; Rector of Wood Walton, Huntingdonshire.

Palmer, Rev. C. S., Rector of Eardisley; Rural Dean of Weobley, Division I.

Phillips, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of Tregaron; Surrogate for the Diocese of St. David's.

Streatfeild, Rev. W. C., Rector of King's Worthy; Rector of Frant, Sussex.

Taylor, Rev. Canon W. F., D.D., Vicar of St. Chrysostom's, Everton, Rural Dean of Walton; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Liverpool.

Usher, Rev. William Neville, Rector of Stow-in-Lindsay; Rural Dean of Lawres, No. II.

◆

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barton, Rev. William, Vicar of St. George's, Millom, at St. George's Vicarage, on the 4th inst., aged 49.

Bremridge, Rev. James Philip, Vicar of Winkleigh, at Winkleigh, N. Devon, on the 11th inst., aged 67 years.

Broome, Rev. J. H., for forty-two years Vicar of Houghton, near Swaffham, on the 8th inst., aged 86.

Chancellor, Rev. William Bartlett, C.M.S., at Park View, Ellington Road, Ramsgate, on the 4th inst., aged 38.

Davis, Rev. James Henry, British Consular Chaplain at Monte Video, on the 1st inst., aged 32.

Gray, Rev. John Edward, at Wembley Park, Harrow, on the 10th inst., aged 87.

Kewley, Rev. George Robinson, Vicar of Walford, formerly Fellow of Durham University and Vicar of St. John's, Kidderminster, at Walford Vicarage, Ross, on the 6th inst., aged 65.

Parkin, Rev. John, for forty-nine years Vicar of St. Clement, Halton-in-Hastings, at Halton Vicarage, Hastings, on the 7th inst., aged 84.

Wilkins, Rev. Henry Musgrave, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, at Merton College, Oxford, on the 7th inst., aged 64 years.

Wright, Rev. Buchanan Warren, Vicar of Norton Cuckney, at Nottingham, on the 6th inst., aged 77.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TIME OF VISITATION.

By Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, August 14th, 1887.

"Because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."—Luke xix. 44.

THIS Gospel carries us back to Palm Sunday; it fixes our attention on a single incident of that solemn entry into Jerusalem which our Lord and Saviour made before He suffered. The exact scene of no circumstance in our Lord's life can be more certainly determined than that of his weeping over Jerusalem. He was on His way to the Feast of the Passover; He had walked up the long, steep, desolate road which leads to Jerusalem from Jericho. He slept one night at Bethany, in the highly-favoured home of Mary and Martha, to whom, by His great miracle, He had lately restored their brother Lazarus; in the morning He would move on towards the Holy City. He was accompanied by a crowd of pilgrims and disciples, whose enthusiasm was roused to the highest pitch by all that they had seen and heard in Bethany respecting the raising of Lazarus. And He was met by another crowd, made up of disciples and friends within Jerusalem, who also had heard of the great miracle, and who poured out of the Holy City to conduct Him in triumphal procession to the festival. They probably joined Him just as He was leaving Bethany, and then the whole mingled crowd of disciples and pilgrims turned its face towards Jerusalem. Within five minutes of their leaving Bethany they would have reached a ridge from which a first very partial view of the Holy City is obtained. From this point Zion and the Tomb of David are visible, while the buildings in the Temple area and everything beyond away to the North are hidden behind a southern spur of the Mount of Olives. On this first ridge of the road Dean Stanley is probably right in placing the singing of the hymn—

> "Hosanna to the Son of David!"

Here the men from Jericho and Bethany laid down their outer garments in the path of the advancing Redeemer; here the men from Jerusalem strewed the palm branches which they had cut from the gardens on their way out from the Holy City in the early morning. But this first ridge was soon crossed, and then the road descends sharply to the right, so as to wind round the end of a deep valley that runs into the southern side of the Mount of Olives, and then it turns to the left, and then it climbs up along the side of the spur of the Mount just referred to, but at the top it turns again to the right before beginning the descent into the valley of the Kedron. This last piece of the road would have been traversed by a slowly moving procession in about half an hour, and the time was probably occupied by repeating the hymn—

> "Hosanna to the Son of David!"

When the second ridge was reached the occurrence described by the Evangelist took place. For this second ridge of the road between Bethany and Jerusalem commands the most complete of any of the views of the Holy City. On the left of the spectator is the Mount of Offence, with its sad memories, and on the right the southernmost summit of the Mount of Olives, covering that great subterranean sepulchre which tradition terms the grave of the prophets. In front the road sinks, by a deep descent down, past the tomb of Absalom into the deep valley of the Kedron, and along the opposite ridge there rises the eastern wall of the Holy City. The modern traveller, indeed, sees rising within the wall of the sanctuary the two mosques which, alas! now stand within that sacred enclosure. He hardly sees the tomb, with the Church of the Sepulchre behind; but even for him Nature and Art between them form a picture which, once beheld, can never be forgotten. When our Lord gazed on it it was certainly more beautiful than it is now. Behind the city there rose valleys and gardens which were shortly afterwards enclosed within the so-called third wall. The Hill of Zion was then crowned with palatial edifices, to which nothing now corresponds, while the Temple stood forth in all its beauty—a beauty which certainly, in some respects, exceeded that of the days of Solomon. Herod had greatly enlarged the Temple area; Greek marbles and Greek artists drew forth the exclamation from the Galilean disciples: "Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here." And the sacred edifice itself, with its burnished roof and lofty towers, had been scrupulously restored, as far as the fabric went, to the full measure and splendour of its earliest days. In this spot, in this building, were concentrated the great memories of God's first revelation of Himself to man; here most assuredly were centered all the religious feelings that were most tender and most intense in ancient Israel. As the procession reached this striking point of view, the ancient words must have risen to many memories, to many lips:—"The Hill of Sion is a fair place and the joy of the whole earth: upon the north side lieth the city of the great King. God is well known in her palaces as a sure refuge: Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity in itself. My soul hath a desire and longing to enter into the courts of the Lord: My heart and my flesh rejoice in the living God." Here, before this sight of surpassing interest and beauty, our Lord paused, "He beheld the city"; His eyes gazed, as it seemed, intently on the Temple, the towers, the walls, the palaces which make it what it is. He beholds the city, and, as He beholds, His eyes fill with tears; for He sees not merely the scene before Him which others around Him also see: He sees another scene which will be witnessed from this very point of view in less than forty years. He sees six Roman legions encamped around the city, one of them on the Mount of Olives itself. He sees the heathen soldiers throwing up a stockade, not merely on the level northern and eastern sides, but on the steep southern and western sides, and then He watches what is a sadder sight by far—He watches the fierce, implacable factions struggling for mastery within the walls: He follows the desperate sallies of the besieged; the progress of the besiegers, steady, persistent, resistless; the agony which inevitable famine and disease inflict on the vast poverty-stricken multitude cooped up within those narrow precincts; the emaciated corpses of the dead, which are thrown over the walls; the crucifixion by the Romans of multitudes of fugitives; the capture, first of the third wall, then of the second, then the fierce struggle around the very gates of the Temple; the burning of the Temple; the last desperate resistance on the heights of Zion, until at last fire and sword have done their work, and Jerusalem is a heap of ruins smouldering over the bodies of thousands of Jews. All this, and more, passes before His illuminated soul, and then there followed the words: "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side. And shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."

What was the "visitation" the time of which Jerusalem knew not? The idea of visitation implying some special intervention on God's part in the affairs of man is common to both Testaments. It is natural to expect such interventions if we believe that the world is swayed and is governed by a Living Being who is at once All-mighty and All-holy. The extraordinary thing would be, if, being what He is, He could behold this dark and intricate scene of human life, and yet refrain from doing something to bless, something to improve, something to warn, as the case might be. An epicurean deity sitting apart, careless of human misery, careless of human sin, careless of human struggles, is not the being whom we name God. God, the true, the only God, is, before all things, love, justice, sanctity. He is a Moral Being, and a visitation such as this might be anticipated. God's visitations are connected in Scripture with various purposes. The common use of the word associates it with judgment, with judicial infliction of punishment of some sort, and thus the Second Commandment speaks of God's "visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children." Again, they are often connected with the purpose of blessing, as when God is said to have "visited" Sarah before the birth of Isaac, and Hannah before th birth of Samuel. And Scripture speaks of God visiting us in giving us the fruits of the earth in due season; and a Psalmist says, in words which just now will come closely home to us, "Thou visiteth the earth and waterest it." This sense of visitation as an occasion of blessing may be illustrated by the fine saying of Hooker—that the most comfortable visitations God has sent men from above have taken especially the times of prayer as their most natural opportunities. The Psalmist cries in agony: "Stand up, O Lord God of hosts, thou God of Israel, to visit all the heathen"; and God says of the unfaithful house of David that He will visit their sins with wrath and their sins with scourging. In this sense Moses uses the expression, "the visitation of God to man," as equivalent to death of an ordinary kind; and Hosea explains the day of visitation to man as a day of recompense; and this peculiarly solemn sense of the word survives among us in one of those religious phrases which still cling about the language of the law, as when a coroner's jury returns a verdict that a man has died by the visitation of God. And Bishop Jeremy Taylor uses the word to signify some calamity less than death when he says: "That in Holy Scripture which thou dost not understand, when thou readest thou shalt understand in thy day of visitation; for many secrets of religion," he adds, "are not perceived until they are felt, and are not felt but in the day of a great calamity."

Divine visitations are often connected with the purpose of blessing. God is said to have visited sorrow. The dying patriarch, Isaac, assures his descendants in Egypt that "God will surely visit you," and in the revelation to Moses the Lord said to him: "Go and gather the elders of Israel together, and say unto them, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, appeared unto me, saying, I have surely visited you."

Nay, God visits us, in giving us the fruits of the earth in due season. Naomi, living in Moab, had heard that after the famine the Lord had visited His people in giving them bread, and the Psalmist says, in words which just now surely will rise often to our memories: "Thou visitest the earth and waterest it very plenteously."

Once more, visitation means warning—a meaning which is intermediate between that of blessing and of judgment. In this sense the Psalmist speaks of God proving and visiting his heart in the night season. It is in this sense our Lord describes His own ministry as the "Visitation of Jerusalem." Partly, no doubt, it was a visitation of judgment, yet more was it a visitation of blessing, it brought with it instruction, grace, pardon, and thus Zachariah says : "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people, and hath raised up a mighty salvation for us in the house of His servant David. To give knowledge of salvation unto His people for the remission of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God, whereby the day spring from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death, and to guide our feet into the way of peace." And thus, also, after raising the widow's son outside the gate of Nain, St. Luke reports two sayings which were repeated by the by-standers who witnessed our Lord's miracle : "That a great prophet is risen up amongst us," and that "God hath visited His people." Indeed, as the Incarnate Son, our Lord visited His people in an altogether unique sense. Grace and truth came by Him, as they came by none before Him, from their very fountain-head. But His visitation was also a warning. This aspect of His ministry was prefigured remarkably by that of Jeremiah, who, beyond any other prophet, is the prophet of Divine visitation. It was a visitation of warning against some besetting sins of every old and settled religion—against formalism, against hypocrisy, against insincere use of sacred language, against the insincere performance of sacred duties, but it was also a warning especially addressed to the people of Israel, against missing the whole providential drift of the religious past, against taking a fatally wrong turn in their thoughts and aspirations and efforts for the future that was before them.

Why, it may be asked, should the failure to know the time of visitation from above very often be followed by such grave consequences? The answer is, because such failure implies first the decline of spiritual interest, which in those who have had any religious training and opportunities is culpable. To believe sincerely in the Living God who interests Himself in His creatures is to be on the look-out for times of His intervention in the affairs of men ; in other words, for His visitation. When a Divine visitation comes, it is a touch-stone of the state of souls. It finds some anxious, expectant, willing to recognise and make the most of it, and others, as our Lord said, "whose hearts have waxed gross, and whose ears are dull of hearing, and whose eyes are closed." This insensibility to the approach of God in His grace and power wounds the heart of God. It is a bad return for gifts, such as are knowledge and conscience ; it cannot but have grave consequences beyond itself. Moreover, this insensibility to God's approach is not only to be accounted for by the spiritual deadness of those whom He visits, but it generally implies that they are preoccupied with some other interest which for them is more engrossing. Poor indeed must any lesser interest be in rivalry with the Infinite and All-good God. "They have forsaken Me, the fountain of living waters and hewed out cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water." The Jews of our Lord's day have not forsaken the true God for Baal and Ashtaroth, but they have cherished worldly and political ambitions, which had the same effect on them as a formal profession of idolatry. God is, as the Second Commandment tells us, a jealous God. We cannot forsake Him for any thing else with impunity.

And, further, if God visits in warning, to neglect His visitation is to neglect conditions of safety against dangers which are before us. So it was with the Jews. If the Jews had given heed to the teaching of our Saviour the conflict with the Roman authority would never have taken place. That conflict was—at any rate, to a great extent—the result of the manner in which the Jews misunderstood the prophecies and promises of their ancient Scriptures. The true fulfilment of those prophecies and promises was a spiritual one, and one of the objects of our Lord's visitation was to make this plain to them ; if they had accepted Him as their king yet as a king whose kingdom was not of this world, they would have escaped from the false ideas, from worldly hopes which kept them in a fevered dream of national independence, and so brought them into conflict with the masters of the great World Empire. As it was they clung passionately to their false interpretations, and for many years any Syrian fanatic who had a mind to dabble in the troubled waters and in political rebellion had a ready access to their sympathies, and thus, at last, the words were fulfilled : "Thine enemies shall lay thee even with the ground, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." The difficulty for many men is to recognise at the critical moment the fact that God is visiting them. All seems so ordinary, so common-place, so like what has happened to ourselves before, so like what is happening to others now. Was it not thus with Jerusalem eighteen centuries ago in her day of visitation? To her the Prophet of Nazareth seemed at best only one of numbers of prophets. His were not the first miracles, or the first instructions, or the first denunciations, or the first warnings that had been heard or witnessed within those ancient walls : prophets were to be expected : they were a natural product of the higher genius of the race. They were not all of them equally entitled to deference. He Himself repeated the warning against false prophets as well as false Christs. The difficulty was to see in this event, in this visitation, its exceptional significance, something more than the natural product of an immediate antecedent or cause, some distinct evidence of the working presence of that love and wisdom which rule the world. The most vitally important days and weeks in the history of a soul may have little to distinguish them outwardly from other days. It needs the earnest, penetrating recognition of God's unceasing and loving interest in His creatures to read life aright, whether it be corporate or individual life, to see the moral and spiritual worth of events. Our Lord once told His hearers that they could predict the weather of the following day from the appearance of the sky at sunset, but that they could not read the signs of the times, that they had no eye for the moral and the spiritual world, and we must know that in this as well as in other respects there are successors among, it may be in, ourselves.

It may be said that there is room for a great deal of illusion in this matter of Divine visitation. We may easily think ourselves more important people than we really are; we may imagine that the events of our little lives have a meaning and worth which does not belong to them. Is there any test or criterion of "His visitation?" Well, my brethren, we have, first of all, to remember that no human life at any moment is other than an object of the deepest interest to God. He who made, He who redeemed, He who sanctified us does not think any life too insignificant to be visited by Him. The hairs of your head are all numbered. It is impossible that the Infinite Love should ever despise the work of His own hands, the purchase of His own cross. There is no ground for the idea that we are making too large an assumption in the supposition that our little lives are objects of deep interest to the infinite God. The only question is whether we are warranted in thinking that His interest and oversight have at a given time reached a special climax or visitation, having exceptional claims on our attention, and we are justified in thinking that this is the case if the truth which such a visitation enforces is in correspondence with the higher truth which we have learned before, though, perhaps, going beyond it, and if the conduct to which we are imperilled or encouraged involves self-denial, involves that which is unwelcome or exacting. It would have cost Jerusalem something to have known practically the time of her visitation; but to have done so would have been in strictest accordance with the teaching of the law and the prophets, as it would have averted her impending doom.

"The time of thy visitation"—this is an expression which should sink deep in the memory of every soul, for it implies that every visitation of God comes at a predestined time, that it comes, passes, and does not return. So it is with societies of men, with nations, with churches; they have their great heaven-sent opportunities, for which their previous history is a preparation, and which they may fail to recognise and make the most of. God visits a nation when at a critical moment in its history He bids it maintain some imperilled principle or do some great act of justice, or abolish some ancient abuse. Perhaps the opportunity has been neglected; it passes, and then the sentence of national decline and fall is written on the page of history, with the added reason: "Because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." And God visits at His own time the several branches of His Church. It may be after long years of apathy and darkness. He visits a Church when He raises up in her teachers who insist upon forgotten aspects of truth, who call men from false standards of life and thought to Apostolic rules of living; or when He opens great ways of extending His Kingdom, and of influencing numbers of human beings to seek the things that belong to their peace. If this invitation to better things is set aside, nominally as if it were the revival of some old superstition, or rather really because it makes an unwelcome demand on the conscience and the will, then the day of visitation passes, and the doom of the Church which comes with time is justified in the conscience of its own children. Because it knew not the time of its visitation.

Souls are the units of which nations and churches are composed, and God visits a soul when he brings before it a new vision of truth and duty, a new range of opportunities. Individual souls were visited in the course of our Lord's ministry no less than was Jerusalem. So it was with Simon and Andrew, when Jesus, walking by the Sea of Galilee, said to them: "Follow Me;" so it was with Matthew, sitting at the Receipt of Custom, when Jesus said to him: "Follow Me;" so it was with the man who, being called, pleaded that he might go and bury his father, and to whom Jesus said sternly: "Let the dead bury the dead." One of yourselves, we will say, has been for years recognising just so much of religious truth as the people about him, and no more, giving just as much thought to it, and no more; acting just so far upon the duties which it suggests, and no further, your thought and practice are, as we say, conventional, that is to say, they are determined by the average feeling of those among whom you are thrown in life, and not by any personal sense or grasp of religious principle, of what religious truth is, of what is due to it, of what is due to the infinite and Everlasting God. And then something occurs which appeals to the soul as nothing has appealed to it before, which puts life, destiny and duty, truth, Holy Scripture, the Cross of Christ, the Person of Christ, the sacraments of Christ, the Church of Christ before it in quite a new light. It may be a sentence in a letter; it may be a sudden thought which takes possession of you at the time of prayer; it may be a friend who insists on truths which have hitherto been mere phrases to you, in so clear and convincing a way that you cannot dismiss this new impression; it may be that you suddenly find yourself obliged to decide between two courses—one involving sacrifice more or less painful, and the other the surrender of something which your conscience tells you is right and true, and the having to make a decision puts a strain on your moral being, which is of itself a visitation. Or one who has been intimately associated with you for many years has died; his death unveiled to you for a time the unseen and eternal world has taught you the emptiness of this passing life, it has put you out of heart with the half-hearted religion of past years; in short, this trial, while it presses heavily on your heart, has gone far to make you quite other than what you were. And this is a visitation. God is speaking to your soul, and much depends on your understanding Him, on your resolving and acting and re-fashioning your life accordingly. Much, I say, depends on this; for be sure that it is very serious to have enjoyed such a religious opportunity and to have neglected it.

No Divine visitation leaves us where it found us; it always leaves us better or worse. To have been in contact with truth and grace, and to have put it from us, is to be weaker, poorer, worse off —religiously speaking—than we were. When the Divine visitation of the soul has been rejected, then the day of its enemies has arrived; then the legions of hell encamp all around it, the powers of darkness make sure of their victim. There is such a thing as the last chance in the life of a soul. God knows when it has passed by each of us, but one day certainly all of us do, in whatever way, pass it. There are souls for whom our Lord and Saviour, in the fulness of his compassion, shed His blood, yet whose doom He will, as they are judged, one day utter, and the reason of that doom will be because "they knew not the time of their visitation." May He, of His great mercy, condescend to visit us in this our day of life, revealing his will to us more and more clearly, enabling us to understand what He is doing with us, giving us eyes to see, giving us ears to hear, giving us senses so spiritualised as to reach beyond the range of our daily outward lives into that world that is invisible! "Teach me to do the thing that pleaseth Thee, for Thou art my God; let Thy loving spirit lead me forth into the land of righteousness."

◆

A SPECIAL farewell service was held in the chapel of the convent, Feltham, on Wednesday afternoon, the 14th inst., when a handsomely-worked cope was presented to the Bishop of New Westminster by the Mother-Superior and sisters. The Bishop afterwards addressed a meeting in the convent garden. His lordship has since sailed in the s.s. *Parisian.*

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
From Mr. CHARLES WHEELER, Barford, Warwick.
"I have felt so greatly benefited by wearing your **ELECTROPATHIC BELT**, that it affords me pleasure to be able to testify to its **curative power.** The swelling and pain in my legs have quite left me, and I experience a comfortable and warming sensation throughout my body.'
GOUT & SCIATICA CURED
Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of the **Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,** should at once stop physicing, and remit 21*s.* for HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials POST FREE. **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1887.

PAROCHIAL UNITY.

IT has often been said, that of all bodies of Christians there is less of the spirit of unity and brotherly concord between members of the Church of England than between those of any other religious body. There is a great deal of truth in this; we have often heard of people attending one church for years, and never meeting their clergyman. This may be accounted for in various ways. One great feature of the Church of England is that her work is parochial, and according to the ideal every parishioner, no matter what position of life he occupies, has a claim on the ministrations of his clergyman; this can be carried out in rural parishes, but it is almost impossible in large town parishes of eight, ten, and sometimes fifteen thousand people for the clergyman to know all, even though he may have the most perfect organisation. Further, in many places, district churches have been erected without any properly defined parochial boundary, and mainly supported by pew rents, and therefore without some special organisation it is impossible for the clergy to come into close contact with every individual member of the congregation, hence the appearance of want of unity and concord.

In order to remedy to a certain extent this state of things, it would be well for a box to be placed at the church door for those who would like to see the clergyman, and also, it would be well for some persons to be told off, sidesmen and churchwardens for instance, to look out for every new comer, and if finding that they attended regularly to intimate the same to the clergy, and so try to enlist the help which might be obtained for work of some kind or other.

This is done by Dissenters, and we see no reason why churchmen should be afraid to take a leaf out of their book. We remember many years ago, a lady accidentally attending a morning service at a dissenting chapel, and as she came out some one spoke to her, and stated the willingness if she attended to find her a sitting. And we believe that if more of this interest were shown by Church people, many outsiders might be gathered in. We have heard Church people compared to a rope of sand—with no organic unity—while if we look abroad at Nonconformists, we find that they are bound together by certain bonds of union; but with Dissent, it must be borne in mind, that the social element has a great deal to do with its success; the congregation, especially in large towns, are drawn mostly from the shop-keeping class, with a fair sprinkling of artisans and mechanics, and they meet together socially, class distinctions being to a certain extent obliterated; this cannot be done in the Church of England, inasmuch as her congregations are drawn from every class—from the highest to the lowest—yet the clergyman has a great opportunity of breaking down the many barriers that impede and hinder Church work; and can, if he is wise and discreet, bring about a great deal more harmony, and also infuse a more united spirit.

There is yet another way by which parochial unity may be helped forward, and that is by finding work for all who are willing to help. In many parishes it is only the shop assistants and others who are willing to give their time for Sunday School teaching. Strange as it may seem, yet it is perfectly true, that those who have to work hard six days in the week, are willing to help forward God's work on the seventh; while others, who have plenty of leisure, are for this and other kindred works conspicuous by their absence. Yet surely this ought not to be. What is wanted is some power to call forth the latent energy of many of those who attend our churches, and who have the time, the gifts, and the education to help forward the work, and it seems little less than a reproach for a large and well-to-do congregation to leave the care of the children, and other works, to those who perhaps are least fitted, as far as education is concerned, their only passport being true love to God and their fellow-men. If only those who have the ability would come forth, what an influence for good the great Church of England might possess! Another way by which parochial unity might be further developed is by the establishment of guilds, communicants' unions, etc., so that all may be brought together, each sharing one another's work, meeting together for prayer and communion, showing forth that they are members of one great brotherhood, and that the interests of the parish is theirs, that they have a part to bear in the work of God in connection with the Church in which they worship.

Further, we think a great deal more might be done by means of letters of commendation, so that when a family leaves a parish they may be handed on to the vicar of the parish where they are going to reside. This is one great feature of the Girl's Friendly Society, and the Young Men's Friendly Society, and if it is necessary for our young women and young men, surely it is equally necessary for whole families when they move from one place to another. We may trace a good deal of the leakage that has taken place to the want of letters of commendation. In a new place they feel strange; they know no one, with the result that very often the church is neglected, the children who used to attend Sunday School, the parents who used to attend their old parish church, grow listless and indifferent, feeling it may be that "no man careth for my soul."

If some of these plans could be carried out, they would materially strengthen the Church's influence, and promote the true spirit of unity and concord in every parish.

THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Vicar of Warrenpoint, Ireland.

I.—Introductory.

It is not always possible for a clergyman to "live peaceably with all men." Should his lot be cast in a neighbourhood where any of the Christians known as Plymouth Brethren reside or to which they resort, "peaceable relations" are out of the question. It is true the sect is numerically contemptible; it is no less true that the Brethren make up for the want of numbers by a zeal that might very favourably compare with that of the followers of Mahomet or Ignatius Loyola. They hold peculiar views and they are not above propagating them in a peculiar manner. They live and move and have their being in an atmosphere of controversy. To engage in religious discussion with one of the Brethren without some previous acquaintance with the controversy is to court certain defeat, as they are for the most part accurate students and diligent readers of the Holy Scriptures, and they are, moreover, skilful in the manipulation of texts and utterly unscrupulous in their manner of dealing with them.

When it suits their purpose the Brethren quote freely from the Old Testament, but when the Old Testament is quoted against them they dismiss it contemptuously as having been meant only for Jews, or for those who lived in the dispensations prior to the giving of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. But this is not all. Some of them treat the New Testament itself with irreverence, to use no harsher term. They advise believers not to dwell on "those bits of Gospels," but go on to the Epistles. One of them finding St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy inconvenient, explains the matter by the suggestion that the *Apostle himself knew* that in his first Epistle his teaching was liable to cause errors, and consequently wrote a second letter to guard against misconceptions. Even the personal teaching of Christ they set aside with calm superiority, and refuse to use the Lord's Prayer as being inconsistent with their position and privileges as believers. Of course such free and easy handling of the Word of God has, on the one hand, brought Brethrenism into painful nearness to Rationalism, but it has added no breadth nor toleration to the system.

"The system which a generation ago began upon a basis of universal fellowship, has ended with universal excommunication, and those leaders who once repudiated ecclesiasticism as the crying sin of Christendom, have returned to all the vices of the systems they have left by their exclusive claim to ministry, their superstitious regard for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and their daring usurpation of the authority and privileges of the whole Church of God." *

Somewhat similar is the testimony of Bishop Titcomb: "They are a good but misguided people, and of all others the most separating and schismatic n the Christian Church." † The general tendency is to separation. Wherever Plymouthism has appeared, strife and separation and bitterness and feuds have dogged its steps.

At the same time it must be said that some of the Brethren are better than their professions would lead one to imagine. I knew a dear old lady who has gone home to God. She was, or professed to be, a strict Plymouthist. One day, during the course of a visit I paid her, I made some remark on religion, which drew from her the rejoinder,

"You seem to forget that I am one of the Brethren."

"Perhaps so"; I said, "but you cannot belong to the Exclusives."

"Well, but I do belong to the Exclusives, as you call them. Now tell me why you thought I did not."

"Because when I visit you I have prayer with you, and I understood they never joined in prayer with outsiders," was my reply.

"Oh," cried the poor old lady lifting up her hands, "God forbid I should ever be in such a state as to prevent the clergyman coming to have prayer with me."

When we come to consider the views of the Brethren we shall have more to say on their separating tendencies. Here it may suffice to notice that some of them carry the "separation" craze much farther than others. Some brethren do not allow their own children to take part in family worship because they are "unbelievers." Some deem it necessary even during grace at dinner to draw an ostentatious distinction between themselves and others. Some will remain at family worship if they happen to be in a friend's house, and after or before it explain that though present they must not be understood as in any sense joining in the service. They do not wish to act as magistrates, but I believe they do not object to hold civil appointments; they take no part even in Bands of Hope, and will not unite in charitable enterprizes with members of other religious denominations. Wherever it has made its appearance the system has produced paralysis of spiritual energy and left behind a crop of bitterness and strife. This was apparent in the Tinnevelly Mission.

"And wherever on the continent of Europe, in France, Italy or Spain, a deep and widespread impulse has been given to the Roman Catholic masses through the labours of the Waldenses or the Evangelical societies of the Continent, the Plymouth Brethren, scenting their prey from afar, gather to the scenes of awakened life, and sowing the seeds of discord among the new converts by denouncing the communion of all other Churches as essentially impure, and their system of ministry as essentially Popish, have thrown many of the perplexed converts back into the Roman communion while others have under their influence withdrawn into little hot-bed communions of the Brethren." *

At home it has crept into churches, and brought in its train suspicions, strifes, and heart-burnings innumerable. It has entered households, and set wife against husband, and child against parent, and friend against friend. From their point of view the world is evil and only evil, therefore as all outside their system belong to the world, the line of separation is easily drawn, and the Church of Rome is not more arrogant in support of her claims to be the one true Catholic and Apostolic Church than are the Brethren in representing themselves as "the Assembly of God." With a certain class of people assertion goes a long way. If the assertion be made with positive assurance, and supported by appearances of reality, so much the better. The Church of Rome asserts that she is infallible. She has never proved it, yet the hope of finding within her pale infallible guidance has drawn many a devout Christian into her fold. Rome promises both an infallible guide, and also certainty of salvation to her votaries. It is very noteworthy that on both these points she has been closely followed by the Brethren. They, too, have an authority, which, if they are to be believed, cannot be wrong, for "the Assembly of God," as they term the structure they have erected in place of the Church, is under the direct "presidency" of the Holy Spirit, and "there is nothing according to their ideas between John the Evangelist of Patmos, and John Nelson Darby of Plymouth." The real strength, however, of the system lies in the adaptation of its popular teaching to meet the cry of human nature for an authoritative declaration of the present forgiveness of sin. The case is stated as a rule somewhat thus :—

"Are you saved?"

"Well, I hope God will have mercy on me through Christ. I try to do right. I hope for forgiveness."

"*Hope?* Have you nothing better than *hope?* I am sure. God says: 'Believe': 'He that hath the Son *hath* life.'" And so on.

It is without question a most fascinating doctrine, that by mere acceptance of the fact that Christ died on the Cross for sin eighteen centuries ago, therefore all the sins of the individual—past, present, and future —are taken away. We shall consider it more in detail when we come to dwell upon the doctrines of the Brethren. According to Plymouth views any one "hoping for salvation" is a witness "*against* Christ."

This is how it is put (*Gospel Messenger*, Vol. I. 1886, page 38) :—

"Suppose I come from further China, where Confucius is the object of faith, and I meet a person and ask him, 'What are you?' 'Oh, I am a Christian.' 'What do you know about Christ?' 'I know He is a Saviour.' 'What did He do?' 'He died to save sinners.' 'Do you believe on Him?' 'Yes.' 'Then you are saved?' 'Oh, I could not say that. I hope to be, but I couldn't say that I am saved.' 'Well,' I reply, 'I am a believer in Confucius, and I hope the same. I hope to be saved. I am as well off as you. Your Christ does no more for you than Confucius for me. He passed through fire and water. I shan't turn to your Christ.' Is not that a witness against Christ."

---

* "Plymouth Brethrenism. Its Ecclesiastical and Doctrinal Teachings."—*Quarterly Review*, October, 1873. Reprinted 1874. Hodder and Stoughton, London.

† "Plymouth Brethren." By the Right Rev. J. H. Titcomb, D.D., Late Bishop of Rangoon. Supp. Chapt., Gladius Ecclesiæ. Reprinted by the Church of England Sunday School Institute.

* "Plymouth Brethrenism."—*Quarterly Review*, October, 1873, *ibid.*

This is what Plymouthists call logical argument. The follower of Confucius might, however, happen to be *quite certain* that he was safe. The Mahometan is also *certain*. The Romanist equally *certain*. The five foolish virgins positively *certain*. Does believing that a man is saved save him? Is he saved because he believes that he is saved? Then faith is merit. According to the Brethren:—

"God is depicted as selecting certain persons as the object of special favour denied to others, the favoured persons being not the best, the most virtuous, the most unselfish, but the most self-confident. The favour with which these persons are regarded is not diminished, whatever their sins may be, and on the other hand, if they who are not so favoured strive to their utmost to do God's will, their 'doing' is in itself a deadly thing sufficient to ensure their condemnation. If it could be proved that this were the doctrine of the Bible, it would follow that the Bible did not come from that God who loves righteousness and does justice."[*]

Sometimes the Brethren act on the principle of doing evil that good may come. They are not over-scrupulous in the use of means. Trading as they do in revivals, their custom is to take advantage of religious movements set on foot by other denominations, and having crept in as undenominational Evangelists gradually to pave the way for unfolding their own peculiar views. Long practice has made them adepts in this species of ecclesiastical skirmishing. On one occasion a minister is said to have allowed certain evangelists the use of his church for a year, on the repeated assurance that they were not Plymouth Brethren. One of them at last, more honest than the rest, avowed the fact, when they were excluded from the Church, and their duplicity was exposed, but they excused it by saying that they were not Plymouth Brethren, but Brethren, as "*they did not live at Plymouth.*"

Spurgeon says: "Concerning that sect, much as I love and respect many of its members, I dare not say less than this, that God alone knows what they will teach to-morrow, for they seem to be given up to the inventions of their own vain-glorious minds, to concoct and devise delusions without number."

The Brethren have revived more than one of the heresies which in early ages distracted the Church. They hold erroneous and in some cases pernicious views concerning *the humanity* and *death* of Christ, *the Church*, *the Ministry*, *Justification*, *Sanctification*, *Baptism*, *the Moral Law*, *Faith*, *Prayer*, *and Repentance*. They are always Millenarians and generally Baptists, although Mr. Darby has remained a Pædo-Baptist. Sometimes they baptise believers into the name of Jesus only, and the following is a doxology circulated by certain of the evangelists:—

From Jesus Christ all blessings flow,
He's Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.[*]

As a specimen of Plymouth teaching, I heard lately of an evangelist who said: "Many of those using the Lord's Prayer would be nearer the mark if they began thus, 'Our Father who art in hell.'" Startling this, if not reverent.

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—The charge of Rationalism brought against the Catholic Party by Canon Crosthwaite completely falls to the ground by his explanation of the charge. He accuses them (1) Of unlimited private judgment, or "the Bible and the Bible alone, the religion of Protestants"; (2) Of contradicting the Articles and formularies of the English Church. The second charge is effectually disposed of by his avowal that the Court of Arches acquitted Mr. Bennett on the following grounds, namely, that the doctrine of the real, spiritual, objective Presence, and the adoration thereof, was "the doctrine taught by the formularies of our Church, duly considered, and constituted so as to be harmonious, and did not contravene the law of the Church" (see judgment). The first charge can be easily repelled upon true Catholic (in opposition to Popish) lines. The Catholic lines upon which we base our right to separate from Rome are—the teaching of the Bible, and that of the undivided Church. Virtualism is based upon the private opinion of one or two individuals in the sixteenth century, so has no more weight than the doctrine of infallibility of the Pope. I alluded to the statement in page 10, the Canon's pamphlet, when claiming to hold the same opinion. Not a word in that page beyond "some sense," and the expression on the title page, "*mysterious* Presence in the Holy Eucharist," we can adopt as our own view likewise. If a thing can be *explained*, which is done by Virtualists, Swinglians, and Papists, all *mystery* is at an end. It seems presumptuous on the part of an amateur female theologian to oppose the learned Canon, "whose praise is in all the churches," but I only follow the precedent of Balaam's ass, etc.

SOPHIA J. MARSHALL.

SIR,—I have often thought, when enjoying a quiet read of your excellent journal, what a blessing it was that no "Irish Churchman" had discovered its calm retreat, when, alas! in the last number, September 3, Monsieur Thonson rushes upon the stage, "Here we are again!" brisker than ever, developed from "Irish Churchman" into Sophia J. Marshall. She makes her single-handed championship of Catholic truth, during months of controversy in the *Dublin Evening*

---

[*] "The Sin of Mutilating the Gospel Message," by the Rev. George Salmon, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, T.C.D. Dublin, 1876.

[*] See "An Antidote to Plymouth Brethren Tendencies," by the Rev. R. Galbraith, M.A. Dublin: Charles & Co., 61, Middle Abbey Street.

Mail, the plea for her being heard. Well, what is it? For that incessant hum, to which we were treated "during months of controversy," reminded me painfully of the buzz of the Tsetse fly, which once heard—Livingstone tells us—will never be forgotten. She has settled on Canon Crosthwaite, over whom she has been gyrating for months, and gained at last all that her soul longed for. The Catholic truth of the real spiritual objective Presence, which she has championed single-handed, the Canon has given in to. She claimed no more; no less would satisfy. I must leave the Canon to his fate, and would only remark that ladies are like hares, which always return to their forms. Nine months ago she started from this "real spiritual objective Presence." That is the "*it*" she worships, and not *them, i.e.*, the accidents which go to make up that "*it*." The material clod, which I metaphorically flung after her on that occasion, took the form of a letter to the *English Churchman and St. James's Chronicle*, in which I pointed out that the person worshipping any "*it*" is simply an idolator. Adoration can never contravene the law of the Church, no matter where administered, so long as the *it* worshipped is made to mean a person at one time, and anything else at another. So now, after months of controversy, we see S. J. Marshall back again on her old form, worshipping she knows not what.

JUDEX.

◆

WORSHIP NO PROOF OF GOD'S EXISTENCE.

SIR,—In his sermon on "Love," in the PULPIT of the 10th inst., the Rev. E. M. Venn indulges in a digression concerning the worship of a Deity in uncivilised countries. He rightly maintains that in the most savage portions of the globe the idea of a personal Deity is to be found; and goes on to affirm that the antiquity and universality of belief in a God can only be accounted for by the fact that that belief is a true belief. He recommends this argument as a safe weapon in a contest with atheism. May I be allowed to suggest that the argument is absolutely of no effect on philosophical atheists, and that it has been met and answered by one of their number, J. S. Mill? Mill, in his "Essays on Religion," fully admits the universality of belief in a God or gods. What he does not admit is the fact that this belief is enough to establish the truth of the existence of a God, and he proceeds to show that the belief may be fully accounted for by very different causes. These are the effects produced on the uncultured mind by the ordinary phenomena of Nature. The savage who hears the thunder or perceives the ravages produced by a hurricane, is naturally led to ascribe them to the operations of a superior Being, who, on account of His power, must be propitiated by worship. In the different operations of Nature he sees the exerted wills of a number of different Deities, and his belief inevitably tends to polytheism. Gradually, as the knowledge of nature becomes more extended, as the unity and harmony of her parts becomes more manifest, the savage mind is led to the belief that if there are many gods, there must be One who is more powerful than the rest, and so his belief tends to monotheism or to what practically amounts to the same thing. Mr. Venn maintains that this belief is a proof of the existence of a God. Surely a like argument would prove the existence of an unlimited number of Gods.

It has, I think, been proved by Mill that belief in a Deity in uncivilised countries may be fully accounted for on purely natural grounds, and there is no need to introduce any further arguments upon the subject.

I can agree with Mr. Venn, that arguments are needed against atheists, that they will triumph if we cannot give a reason for the faith that is in us, but I cannot accept the argument which he has brought forward, when I feel it has been fully answered now some years ago.

C. B.

◆

THE MINOR INCUMBENTS OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

SIR,—My note appeared in your last issue under the above heading; and, seeing your note under same, I beg to assure you it is "not collections, or subscriptions, or charity," the Irish clergy want, but "justice" from the Crown and the Government. The Lord has said the labourer is worthy of his hire; the late Government, by the iniquitous Act of Disestablishment and Disendowment, have robbed them of their rights, and left them to struggle hard the last eighteen years.

The cry to redress their grievances by increasing their incomes to what they ought to be, is now earnestly made to our gracious Queen and her present Government to undo the guilty past! Devoted ministers, faithful men who have borne the burden and heat of the day, loyal subjects, after all, in this Jubilee year, are they to be left out in the cold.

JOB.

[In the present political state of Ireland it seems hopeless to expect "the Queen and her present Government to undo the guilty past," *i.e.*, to restore to the Church the property which Mr. Gladstone confiscated. We see no moral or practical good that can accrue to the clergy from the publication of the numerous letters that we have received similar to Job's, whereas if a Clergy Distress Fund were started similar to the one in England, it might result in a proportionate collection, as statistics prove that there is no dearth of money in Ireland. At all events it would demonstrate the estimation in which the Protestant clergy are held by their compatriots.—ED.]

◆

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND CATECHISM.

SIR,—My courteous opponent again accuses me of impudence; at the same time, he twits me with not repeating "this piece of impudence." It is hard to please some people!

2. However, I will come to his argument. The plain fact is, that in the New Preface it is said, "we have added a question, with an answer, taken out of the 28th Article." This I maintain is as much as to say, both question and answer are taken from the 28th Article. Mr. Lawrence argues that all it said was that the answer, not the question, was from the Article. He may depend on the word "with" rather than "and." But this will not serve him. Has he never heard of what lawyers call "leading questions"? To take a question out of one document, and the answer out of another, and then to say that both come out of one, is what no one can maintain as lawful. If I wanted to prove that a Corporal Presence is taught by

our Church, I might take from a Romish book the question, "Is a Corporal Presence true?" and an answer from the Catechism, "the Body, etc., are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful, etc." I might say a question, *with* an answer, are taken from the Church Catechism, and when called to account, I might say that I only spoke of the answer.

3. Mr. Lawrence hints that I cannot be depended on as to quoting from the Report of Master Brooke's Committee. I gave the references to the pages in a former letter, to the effect that the object was to get rid of bread and priest, as a means on God's part, and to make faith, or our fitness, the only requisite. This is to be read all through the Report. There are many still alive who were in our Synod when this question and answer were debated, who can support or expose me if they will. The words of the Article, "given and eaten," it was proposed should be in the new question. But these would imply priest and bread, and therefore they were eschewed, though in the Article. The Catechism was resorted to for "a less full" question, though the Report pretended that the Catechism was to be excluded as "less full."

4. All was done for a purpose. But, at any rate, why could it not honestly have been said, "One question, with an answer taken out of the 28th Article and the Catechism *combined*"; or "One question out of the Catechism, with an *adapted* answer out of the 28th Article?" Why was not this done? Let Mr. Lawrence tell us. That will be more to the purpose than accusing me of impudence, dishonesty, and falsehood, which do not touch the point at all. All I ask for is

EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.

A SUGGESTION FOR A PAINTER.

PAINT us two pictures, which may represent
The sorrows and the hopes of humankind.
The first, our father Adam's banishment
From Eden, where the angel guard behind,
And flaming sword on high, all access bar
To where the trees of life and knowledge are;

And Eve turns back to weep, and gaze once more
On her lost home; but Adam lifts his eye,
Serene though sad, the regions to explore
Of that vast world where he must toil and die;
And Satan, like a serpent coiled, is near,
Exulting in a triumph mixed with fear.

And let the other show the Lord ascending
Up to the heavens to meet His Father's love.
Below, His faithful followers attending,
The cloud of light awaiting Him above;
The cross, the grave, the stone rolled back, and lying
Below them all, the serpent crushed and dying.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

* * *

AT Trinity College, Cambridge, the Greaves Prize for any essay on some subject connected with the history of the British Empire has been awarded to R. J. Wilkinson.

THE President of Queen's College, Cambridge, the Rev. Dr. Phillips, has founded a scholarship at the College, to be called the Phillips Scholarship, of the annual value of £40.

THE examiners for Dr. Lightfoot's Scholarships in 1888 announce that the selected portions of history for the examination are:—1. Theodosius the Great; 2. Wiclif and his followers.

IT is announced that Bishop French is about to resign the see of Lahore, to which he was appointed in 1877, and that he will be succeeded by his Archdeacon, the Ven. Henry J. Matthew.

THE accounts of the recent Worcester Musical Festival show that the collections for the charity are upwards of £1,000, and that the receipts exceed the expenditure by more than £300.

THE Divinity Professors at Cambridge have selected the following subjects for the examination for the Jeremie prizes in the Michaelmas terms:—1 Kings (students are recommended to read the corresponding narrative of Josephus); Daniel (Theodotion and LXX.); the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.

THE Special Board for Law announce that the portion of the digest selected for candidates who present themselves under the regulations of June 9th, 1887, for the first part of the examination for the Law Tripos to be held in the Easter term, 1888, is the title "Mandati vel contra." Dig., Lib. XVII., Tit. 1.

CANON BODY has, with the consent of the Bishop of Durham, trained a number of ladies who are willing to reside among the miners, in order to teach, nurse, and in other ways help the pitmen and their families.

THE Llandaff Diocesan Conference is to meet at Cardiff on Wednesday and Thursday, the 12th and 13th of October. In addition to the reports of committees, the Conference will consider the Church Patronage Bill, clause 13, parochial missions, representation of the laity, the bilingual difficulty, the depreciation in clerical incomes, and the Welsh Intermediate Education Bill.

THE *Pall Mall Gazette* says the Rev. Stewart Headlam has resolved to appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury against the decision of the Bishop of London not to grant him a general licence to officiate in the diocese. He does not doubt the Bishop's discretion in the matter, but he considers that the Bishop has deliberately made the question not one of his right to refuse leave to officiate where he likes, but of his right to refuse the leave for the specific reason which he has given—namely, that Mr. Headlam approves of ballet dancing, and refuses to excommunicate ballet dancers. If the Church thinks that the Bishop should have such absolute power he is willing to submit, but he is advised that the Bishop's action constitutes a gross interference with the personal rights of the clergy.

THE innovation of a surpliced female choir, which was started some time ago at Melbourne, has found its way to England. It was introduced at the harvest festival at Skelton-in-Cleveland. A correspondent says—"The ladies' surplices are exceedingly tasteful, in shape not unlike an M.A. gown, and consist of Scotch lawn, with pleated backs. Purple velvet caps, similar to those worn by D.C.L.'s, complete the attire." The following letter from Canon Liddon, dated May 2nd, appeared in the *Melbourne Argus* of the 8th of June:—"Dear Sir,—There is no truth whatever in the statement that ladies have at any time, with or without ecclesiastical dress, taken part in the services of St. Paul's Cathedral, and I feel sure that no such innovation upon the practice of the Church would be permitted on any consideration whatever by the Dean of St. Paul's and my colleagues in the Chapter. If I am right in understanding you to ask me for an opinion on the subjebt, I should find it difficult to say whether the spectacle of ladies dressed in surplices and so on in church is more irreverent than it is certainly grotesque. It is greatly to be hoped that the good sense and Christian feeling of the Australian churches will steadily discourage anything of the kind, and especially for the sake of the ladies concerned. You are at liberty to make any use you like of this note.—Pray believe me, my dear sir, yours very truly, H. P. Liddon. Rev. J. F. Stretch."

THE Convocations have been prorogued by proclamation to Thursday, the 1st of December.

ON Monday it was announced that ten days' notices of distraints for tithes had been served upon numerous farmers in the parish of Mainlochoy, Pembrokeshire, who refused to pay their tithes in full.

THE *Liverpool Courier* states that the announcement of the appointment of chaplains by the Bishop of Sodor and Man is an error, as the four clergymen who acted as chaplains at his consecration officiated only for the day.

DIFFICULTIES having arisen through many of the Welsh clergy being summoned for their rates and assessments on the tithes and rent-charges for last year which are still unpaid, a case for counsel's opinion has been drawn and submitted to the Solicitor-General, Mr. Poland, and Mr. H. C. Richards. The question principally involved is whether the distraint ought not to be levied on the occupier of the lands, who could deduct the rates when paying his rent or tithe to the owner.

THE Rev. A. E. Dibben, curate of St. John's, Chelsea, warns persons against a man who calls on clergymen, tells a plausible story about his immediate need of money, and presents a seaman's allotment note made out in favour of his brother (so he says) on a voyage to China. "The firm on whom the allotment note was drawn is Messrs. Shaw Saville, of 35, Leadenhall Street, E.C. I advanced him ten shillings on one of these, expecting to reconp myself when the first instalment fell due, but on presentation I was informed that the document was a forgery, and that I was the third clergyman who had been taken in by, apparently, the same impostor."

On Tuesday, the 13th inst., the parish church of Ashby-be-la-Zouch, Leicestershire, was the scene of a wedding especially interesting to the inhabitants of that picturesque town, and to a very large circle of friends. It was that of Miss Alice Denton, the second daughter of the Vicar, with Mr. Norton J. Hughes-Hallett, son of Mr. J. Hughes-Hallett, of Higham, Kent. The Vicar of Ashby gave his daughter away, and the best man was the bridegroom's brother, Captain Hughes-Hallett, of the Seaforth Highlanders, the bridesmaids being Miss Denton, Miss Florence Denton, Miss Gibsone, Miss Palmer, Miss Monica Leitch, Miss Gladys St. John, the bride's train being borne by Master Gordon Leith. The spacious church was filled to its utmost capacity by friends and parishioners, to whose good feeling more than two hundred presents abundantly testified.

ON Wednesday, the r4th inst., shortly before evensong, a stately throne, designed for the nave, and presented to Lichfield Cathedral by the clergy of Derbyshire as a parting gift to the diocese and the Bishop on leaving his lordship's jurisdiction, was formally presented to the Dean and Chapter. The Chapter are bound by statute to provide a seat for the Bishop in the nave, and they have hitherto given him as dignified and convenient a position for hearing the sermons of his Prebendaries, and for conducting occasional nave services, as their means would allow; but this splendid gift will relieve them from all further responsibility on that score. Just at this season of the year it is difficult to gather together any large number of the clergy, and therefore only a small representative body assembled to do honour to the occasion. Their spokesman was Archdeacon Balston, who, in an address full of feeling, dwelt upon the attachment they all cherished for the old diocese to which their county had for ages belonged, upon the memories which clustered round the honoured names of Lonsdale and Selwyn, and upon the affectionate respect which the Derbyshire clergy entertained for the present occupant of the see. Bishop Maclagan then placed himself for the first time in the new seat of honour, and expressed his thanks and the thanks of the cathedral body and of the diocese for the gift. He reminded his hearers how Lichfield had indeed, by the Divine blessing, "been a fruitful mother of children"—having been privileged to be the parent of no fewer than twelve daughter dioceses, Southwell being the last and youngest of the numerous family.

ON Monday week a special meeting of the Church Missionary Society was held at Keswick, to hear addresses from the Rev. F. E. Wigram and Mr. E. Wigram, who have just returned from a tour through India, China, Japan, and North America, having inspected all the principal Church Missionary Society's stations in those countries. The Bishop of London presided, and gave Mr. Wigram a hearty welcome back to England. His lordship said he regarded missionary work as one great reason why the Church of Christ had been created, and urged that the discoveries of science and the marvellously increased facilities of intercourse were a perpetual call to the Church, encouraging her to utilise them in the great work of spreading the Gospel. The Rev. F. E. Wigram said that one marked feature in all the stations which he visited in India was the spirit of inquiry among educated Hindoos. A large number had discarded their old idolatry, and were seeking after something in its place. It was interesting to notice how nearly in many cases they were approaching to Christianity. Dr. Baumann, of Calcutta, asked one Hindoo gentleman if he had ever read the Bible, and the reply was, "Yes, I have read the New Testament eighty-three times and the Old Testament twenty-seven times." There was also a strong feeling growing up in India that the infidelity to which secular education was so largely lending itself was not satisfactory, producing disrespect to parents and disregard of all lawfully constituted authority. Many had expressed a conviction that the spread of Christianity would confer a real benefit upon India. The Church Missionary Society was now occupying all the principal stations on the Indian frontier, and was thus opening out a way to Central Asia. The success which had attended the missionary work was in itself a great call to further efforts. Most of the Missions were at present seriously undermanned, and there was everywhere a cry for more men and increased resources. Mr. E. Wigram said a few words about Krishnagur, and described a Sunday in a native church. A hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Mr. Wigram for his address, and to the Bishop of London for taking the chair.

ON Saturday, the 17th inst., the Rev. J. A. L. Airey, the newly-appointed rector of the united parishes of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, and St. Martin Outwich, "read himself in." The event was looked upon as one of more than ordinary interest, inasmuch as it was the completion of an amalgamation of benefices which was begun fourteen years ago, and by which three districts outside the City were beneficially affected. The church of St. Martin Outwich stood at the Bishopsgate end of Threadneedle-street, and was removed as one of the superfluous City churches, and St. Helen's, which is within almost a stone's throw, and is sometimes called the "Westminster Abbey of the City," was constituted the church of the united parishes. The site of St. Martin's was sold, and the materials removed, and out of the surplus revenues three new churches were built — namely, Christ Church, Stepney (the living being in the gift of the Bishop of London); Holy Trinity, Dalston; and St. Peter's, Limehouse (in the gift of the Merchant Taylors' Company). The aged rector of St. Martin's (the Rev. J. B. Deane) thereafter lived in retirement at Bath, though he was nominated the rector of the amalgamated parishes, until his death, recently, when the Merchant Taylors' Company, who are patrons of the living, presented it to Mr. Airey, first mathematical master of the school belonging to the guild. Meanwhile service was carried on at St. Helen's by Dr. J. E. Cox, the vicar, who is now also far advanced in years, and who during his lifetime will receive £400 a year, and Mr. Airey £800 a year. St. Helen's is one of the few churches which escaped the Great Fire of London, and is full of historical and antiquarian interest. It was originally a priory church, and portions of the fabric are some six hundred years old, but the foundation dates back further than that. There are many interesting monuments in St. Helen's, among them being that of Sir John Spencer; Sir Thomas Gresham, founder of the Royal Exchange; Sir Andrew Judd, who instituted the now large school at Tunbridge; Sir John Crosby, by whom Crosby Hall, close by, was built; Francis Bancroft, the founder of Bancroft's Hospital, which until recently occupied the site where the People's Palace at Mile End now stands; and Martin Bond, who commanded the City Trained Band at Tilbury at the time of the Spanish Armada. Many of the tombs are exceedingly elaborate, and there are also some very fine stained-glass memorial windows.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bache, Rev. Kentish, Curate of Churchill; Vicar of Walford-on-the-Wye.

Barber, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. James's, Elmer's-end, Beckenham; Rector of Kirby, Underdale, York.

Beaumont, Rev. W. E., M.A., Curate of All Saints', South Acton; Vicar of Stowupland, Suffolk.

Belchamber, Rev. George, Curate of Hanmer; Vicar of Threapwood, Cheshire.

Dimock, Rev. N., Vicar of St. Paul's, Maidstone; Chaplain of St. John's, San Remo.

Edwardes, Rev. Evan, M.A., Vicar of Trefeglwys, Montgomeryshire.

Garrett, Rev. James Robinson, Vicar of Peasenhall, Suffolk.

Gathercole, Rev. Michael Augustus, M.A., Rector of Stanton-Norfolk.

Goodacre, Rev. R. H., M.A., Curate; Vicar of Ipstones, Stoke-on-Trent.

Hensley, Rev. Egerton John, Vicar of St. Luke's, Bermondsey; Vicar of Chepstow.

Holbech, Rev. C. W., M.A., Vicar of Farnborough; Honorary Canon of Worcester Cathedral.

Hughes, Rev. Edward, B.A., Rector of Llanaber, Barmouth.

Kennedy, Rev. Mortimer Egerton, Chaplain at Malaga.

Linton, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Birkenhead; Honorary Canon of Chester Cathedral.

Perceval, Rev. Ascelin Spencer, B.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.

Robson, Rev. Ralph Blanch, Vicar of St. Paul's, Goldshill, West Bromwich.

Sharp, Rev. Charles, M.A., Chaplain of Princess Mary Village Home, Addlestone.

Stanley, Rev. Abraham, LL.D., late Chaplain at Lille; Vicar of Stradsett-with-Crimplesham, Norfolk.

Sumner, Rev. Francis Henry, M.A., Vicar of Hurstbourne Tarrant, Andover.

Taft, Rev. J. R., F.G.S., Curate of St. Paul's, Kingston-hill; Rector of Great Massingham, Norfolk.

Vaughan, Rev. Wycliffe, Senior Curate of Preston; Curate-in-Charge of Esholt-with-Hawksworth, near Shipley, Yorkshire.

Werninck, Rev. J. Wynn, Senior Curate of St. Mary's, Weymouth; Vicar of Walditch, Bridport.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Allen, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Newtown, at Newtown Vicarage, Bishop's Waltham, Hants, suddenly, on the 18th inst., aged 74.

Brennand, Rev. Francis Harling, late Curate of Castleside, at the Fort, Milverton, Somerset, on the 2nd inst., aged 33.

Butt, Rev. John Molesworth, formerly, for thirty-four years, Vicar of Wingrave, at Brighton, on the 16th inst., aged 73.

Ellis, Rev. Robert Stevenson, M.A., late Chaplain to the British Legation at Copenhagen, at Ivy Cottage, Rungsted, Denmark, on the 13th inst.

Grant, Rev. R., Fellow of Winchester College, and late Vicar of Bradford Abbas, Dorset, at 11, Clarendon-row, Southsea, on the 15th inst., aged 90.

Oliver, Rev. William, M.A., formerly of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, Vicar of Hadnall, Salop, and Minister in Sole Charge of Christchurch, Needwood, on the 17th inst., aged 78.

Swainson, Rev. Charles Anthony, D.D., Master of Christ's College, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Prebendary of Chichester Cathedral, at the Master's Lodge, Christ's College, Cambridge, on the 16th inst., aged 67 years.

Symonds, Rev. William Samuel, Rector of Pendock, Cheltenham, on the 15th inst., aged 68.

Tracy, Hon. and Rev. Edward Hanbury, at Upper Norwood, on the 12th inst., aged 75.

Twyne, Rev. William, Vicar of Whiteparish, and formerly Rector of Rayleigh, at Whiteparish Vicarage, on the 12th inst., aged 72.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TRADITION OF THE ELDERS.

A SERMON BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS W. GURNEY, RECTOR OF LITTLE HEREFORD, TENBURY.

SERMON PREACHED AT LITTLE HEREFORD.

"Holding the tradition of the elders."—ST. MARK vii. 3.
"Making the Word of God of none effect through your tradition."—ST. MARK vii. 13.

IT is enough for my present purpose to state the well-attested fact that the Jews were clingers to traditions, setting these above the written word, and that consequently they were rebuked by our Lord and Master. We know that the most prominent and mischievous of their traditions brought about our Saviour's death, affirming as it did that Messiah, when He came, should prove a resistless earthly conqueror; for it was only when the Jews were finally disappointed in this their traditional expectation that they delivered up the Lord Jesus to be crucified. To this chief tradition I shall refer again. The lesser traditions which came down to the Jews from their forefathers, though some of them were ungracious and others trivial,* were yet not wide-reaching in their results; but the tradition which set before them a false ideal of the Messiah involved nothing less than the destruction of their church and nation.

Who could have supposed before the event that precisely the learned doctors of the law of Moses should go furthest astray in this matter? Who could have believed beforehand that precisely the Scribes and Pharisees and priests should be the men to deliver up their own Messiah to shame and spitting? Yet so it proved, for they were not able to withstand the tremendous force of their tradition. And to this hour, the abettors, say rather the slaves and thralls, of a fixed and frozen Jewish tradition, lie under the same fatal spell, so that they still refuse to acknowledge as Messiah the "Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief."

But amazing as this is, there is something no whit less amazing that has come down to us from our Christian forefathers. And I am compelled to ask in turn, Who could have believed, before the event, that precisely the bishops and priests and doctors of the Church of Christ, whose duty it was to set forth a God of Love, should be the men to brand the Almighty with the creation of an endless hell? Yet so it was, and is, for they have not been able to withstand the tremendous force of their tradition. The tradition of an endless hell weighs upon Christendom to this hour, after the same fashion as that other does upon the Jews. This is pre-eminently the doctrine of St. Augustine*, who had it at second hand from the heretic Tertullian, and of Calvin, but neither, as I dare to affirm, of the Holy Scriptures in their original tongue nor yet of the earliest and mightiest Christian Fathers.†

Do you ask, brethren, whereon the Jewish tradition of a triumphant Messiah was based? I answer, on a one-sided interpretation of the prophets, mainly due to the overweening pride of certain leading rabbis. Undoubtedly the Jewish tradition of a conquering Messiah had on the surface some scriptural justification, had indeed very considerable apparent authority in the prophetic writings. It needs not to be said that in those writings there was contained a nobler portraiture of the Messiah; but this was wholly missed. Of two seemingly contrary currents, the prouder and more turbulent one was chosen, without regard to the limpid purity and beauty of the neglected stream. A Messiah leading armies and reigning in earthly splendour appealed to lower instincts than a suffering Saviour. The Jews had eyes and ears only for a King of Kings;

---

* *Ungracious* were (1) Corban; (2) The objection to heal the sick, or touch a corpse, or bury the dead, on the Sabbath day.

Trivial were the washing of pots and cups, etc.

On the other hand (writes Rabbi Simeon Singer), see "Future Probation: a Symposium," Nisbet, 1886: "The idea of eternal punishment for temporary wrong-doing was repellent to the native sense of justice of the Jew. . . . Apart from repentance, the effect of which is irresistible even in *articulo mortis*, salvation after death is rendered possible by—

1. The sufferings of the sinner on earth.
2. The sinner's death.
3. The purging of his offences in Gehinnom, and the soul's unexhausted faculty of repentance.
4. The prayers and pious works of survivors.
5. The intercession of justified spirits, and
6. The saving mercies of God."

Let it be noted how much more merciful is the Jewish than the popular Christian creed!

* "It is not to be forgotten, morever, that it is St. Augustine to whom is due the promulgation of the most horrible tenet which ever slandered a God of love and justice, the damnation of all unbaptised infants. His testimony on the present question (Is salvation possible after death?) is put out of court by that one fact, and we need not concern ourselves hereon, much as he can teach us wisely and brilliantly on many other topics of religion. And yet even St. Augustine was not prepared to condemn the milder view altogether, a noteworthy fact in so vehement a controversialist."—Dr. Littledale, "Future Probation: a Symposium." Nisbet & Co., 1886.

† See the erudite array of early patristic testimony in the master-piece of the Rev. Thomas Allin. In this by no means bulky work, noble in conception and in execution, Mr. Allin has struck such a blow against Christendom's evil tradition as should of right prove final. I, for one, can never thank the author sufficiently for a work so touching, so learned, so powerful, wherein moreover all the arguments are drawn from the Faith once delivered to the saints.—"Universalism Asserted." Elliott Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

the Lamb of God was above them and away. And thus it came to pass that they "made the Word of God of none effect through their tradition." Their tradition still stands between them and their acceptance of the Crucified. It is an accursëd tradition, for it deprives God of the moral grandeur of having died for His creatures, and it robs those creatures of their chief cause for gratitude.

Do you ask in turn, brethren, whereon was based the tradition of Christians as to the endlessness of evil? Surely, for one thing—though this does not stand alone—on a one-sided interpretation of the Scriptures. As formerly with regard to the Messiah, so now with respect to God's judgments, there are in Holy Scripture two seeming contrary currents. On the one hand there is the reiterated denunciation of God's æonial or age-long chastisements reserved for impenitent sinners, which, when exaggerated, turns God's mercy into endless wrath; and on the other hand there is the perpetual well-spring of God's universal final mercy in Christ, at which few men dare to draw water. For, though we Christians do not reject the Person, we still underrate the work of the Lamb of God. We insult the majesty of heaven by accounting that, so far as the bulk of mankind is concerned, the Son of God died in vain. We have no eyes or ears for the exceeding greatness of His salvation. And the countless passages which establish this, are, for us, as if they had no existence; and so we, in our turn, "make the Word of God of none effect through our tradition." It is remarkable that the side of Scripture which appeals to the lower nature of man was and is preferred to the less obtrusive but infinitely higher aspect of its teaching. Just as a triumphant Messiah appealed to the baser Jewish sentiment, so now a God of wrath and vengeance makes appeal to lower and darker instincts than One whose name is Love; and therefore this appeal has prevailed, especially in the darker ages.

And now to speak with more particularity of the unhallowed tradition whereby all Christendom has been oppressed for many centuries. What was its rise, its beginning? That may be hard to state with absolute preciseness, but this I will venture to affirm: an evil and odious tradition must have had a hateful birth. Could it by possibility have a loving one? The early Christians were powerless to avenge their own wrongs; but the thought that God would avenge those wrongs would be increasingly sweet to such as were less noble among them. These may have been well pleased to think, You can cast us now to the lions, but our turn will come when we shall be in heaven, and you shall be everlastingly burning in hell.* It is scarcely to be wondered at if Christians could not always rise to a level with their Master's divine precept, "Love your enemies . . . and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." And thus the persecuted upholders of a down-trodden Christianity may unconsciously have avenged themselves upon a triumphant heathendom by casting a lurid light upon the threats of Holy Scripture, exaggerating not unwillingly their force and perverting their meaning.*

But this, we shall all feel, is insufficient to account for the rise of so terrible a tradition. So again, I ask, What more is at the base of the gradual proclamation of everlasting punishment? And here I venture to reply, The innate, or if not that, the acquired cruelty and gloom of man,† more especially when he was what is called an ascetic, that is, one who has withdrawn himself in large measure from life's pleasures and duties. To such an one an austere view of religion, even when that religion was Christianity, would be commended by natural temperament as well as by the evil and licentious times which called, or seemed to call, for uncompromising severity.‡

---

* "The Church of the first three centuries was engaged in a struggle almost for life and death, and that with a heathenism cruel, lustful, and abominable, beyond our present powers to conceive; nor must we forget the doctrine of economy or reserve held by most of the Fathers. To find so many teaching *under these circumstances* the larger hope, promising openly a share—however remote or small—in future blessedness, to the blasphemer, the cruel persecutor, the votary of nameless lusts, though unrepentant in this life, is really wonderful. Such teaching must have seemed something like treason to the struggling Church, a blow aimed at the dearest interests of the Gospel. Such teaching can only be accounted for by the profoundest conviction that it was a vital truth—an essential part of the Gospel. Let us therefore cease to wonder at occasional inconsistency —real or apparent—in the language of the Fathers who teach universalism. The truth is that the fact that any were found to teach it is irresistible proof that it formed so vital a part of Christianity that they dared not teach otherwise."—See the Rev. Thomas Allin's "Universalism Asserted," p. 251.

* A parishioner of C——, thinking that he had been harshly treated by the relieving officer, delivered his mind to his rector as follows: "I dunna wish no 'arm to no mon. But I do whoape as the Loard 'ull pinch 'im 'ard. An' 'er wool too." May not this speech throw a light on the deeper resentment of the early Christians under deeper wrongs?

† Remember that the very conception of mercy and love, as we understand it, though contained in the Gospel, was then unapprehended; it is essentially modern.

‡ The following hymn, though occurring in a work of fiction, claims to have caught something of the gloomy spirit of those early Christian times:—

Sinful is our every breath,
Thus the word of warning saith,
Sinful life, and sinful death.

Would'st thou 'scape eternal woe,
Sinner, all behind thee throw;
Naked to thy Maker go.

Hate existence' barren strife,
Father, mother, sister, wife;
Hate thy body, hate thy life!

Make the sanguine Cross thine own;
Earth and all its glories flown,
Living death be thine alone!

"The Pilgrim's Hymn," from "Majorian," First Epoch, an unpublished dramatic poem by the Rev. Archer Gurney.

And then, alas, did not Christian priests in their public teaching sometimes keep back God's final mercy, even when they believed in it, in order to lay stress upon that divine vengeance which seemed to them more profitable as a subject of contemplation for thoughtless sinners? Great loss ensues when once we begin to make so-called "accommodations" with God's truth, that is, when knowingly we palter and tamper with it for some imaginary good. To this hour we who hold the larger hope—say the great certainty—are urged to forbear from uttering a truth which by possibility may encourage the foolish in their folly. Our answer is that of the Apostle—any other would indeed be unseemly—"Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel."

So then, if I am right, the origin of this most fearful of traditions, whereby Christendom has been wronged, was mainly due to these several causes, a desire for vengeance upon the masterful heathen, a terrified and diseased imagination, some passages of Holy Writ which lent themselves, only too easily, to distortion, and the frightful wickedness and licentiousness of the times. And the weapon which some men forged for use against heathen oppressors, and which others evolved out of a gloomy mind and a perversion of God's Word for the warning of self-indulgent and careless Christians, was to become at length an indiscriminate scourge to Christendom.

In vain did a striking array of God's most illustrious servants, the great so-called Alexandrian school, and other noblest of the Fathers, set larger views of God's mercy and justice before the Church. They made indeed a long and glorious stand, which endured for four centuries and more, but in the end the baser teaching of inferior men prevailed. We know what happens when a foul and muddy torrent rushes into a hitherto clear and pellucid stream; and not otherwise was it here. Doubtless, as I have suggested, the elements of mischief lay ever thickly scattered around, and all that was needed was their concentration by a capable exponent. Then it was, about the close of the fourth century, that the admired, the highly gifted, the brilliant rather than learned, the deeply daring, St. Augustine,[*] Bishop of Hippo, equal in intellect to the mighty teachers whose great authority he disregarded, but, as I conceive, a world behind them in respect of nobility of soul—the fatal man, to whom the Church of Christ pre-eminently owes it that a God of vengeance has been substituted for a God of Love—set fire to a slow-match, which smouldering for awhile, kindled after his death a general conflagration. We may not forget the ignorance of those centuries when the mediæval creed sprang up. It was a time in which the darkness thickened. The faith could not remain pure and noble when a deep moral corruption blended with as deep intellectual ignorance. Presumably, few if any priests could read the original language of Holy Scripture, or of the Greek fathers. For a time the primitive teaching and the novel teaching, as to God's dealings with sinners in the world to come, held their ground together, side by side; and then—to the Church's unspeakable calamity—the dogma of St. Augustine kept the field alone.[*]

There are some forms of madness, which, falling in with popular sentiment, must run their increasingly destructive course; and this dogma of St. Augustine was of them.[†] For, being launched, and having gained a certain impetus—hardly foreseen by its main contriver—it went forth devouring and to devour. And ever with more and more of precision was the monstrous scheme formulated until at length Heaven's blue sky was overcast, and the hearts of Christians were inclined to sternness. For, since God was accounted capable of tormenting His fallen creatures for ever and ever, what should hinder Christians from being harsh and unfeeling? And saint after saint, sinner also after sinner, within the Church's fold, being carried away by the popular craze, added his conventional consent to the conventional authority of other saints and sinners gone before. And, at last, to question the accursed thing became next to impossible; and the result was, and is, a debased Christianity.* And a shocking emulation sprang up among preachers as to who should set forth most keenly the tortures of the damned, their devilish ingenuity and never-ceasing anguish. Oh shame to Christendom when to burn men for errors of faith, real or imaginary, seemed a small matter and altogether logical! And all the while, the doctrine of an endless hell—so late to take root in the Church—was a gigantic error, uncatholic in the highest degree, hiding, nay, blaspheming the Father's goodness, severing from the Incarnation its central glory, setting bounds and limits to the Atonement,† even denying that Christ Jesus "gave Himself a ransom for all," and is "the Saviour of the world," ignoring the Holy Spirit's untiring and victorious labours throughout the ages or æons to come.

---

[*] "St. Augustine tells us that, in his days, there were not only some, but very many or the majority—*quam plurimi*—who compassionated the eternal punishment of the damned, and believed that it would not take place."—"Enchiridion," 112.

"In estimating St. Augustine's claim to decide on so momentous a question, let us remember (1) That he was for most of his youth and early manhood a profligate and a Manichee, traces of which latter fact are quite visible in his theological system; (2) That he was, it may be said, the *virtual* author of the cruel heresy of Calvinism; (3) That he was admittedly—Conf. i. 14—imperfectly acquainted with Greek, a fact in itself an absolute disqualification for a teacher on this point; (4) That he writes waveringly and feebly on the subject of future punishment. See Enchir. lxvii., ix., cxii.—De civ. Dei. xxi."—"Universalism Asserted," p. 109.

[*] "But darker days were at hand. The age of the great Greek Fathers was over, and in the centuries that succeed we have ignorance increasing, and manifold corruptions over-spreading the earlier faith. Of these centuries a dismal picture might with truth be drawn: a venal clergy, a superstitious people, and ignorance abounding; so that probably in the West very few could so much as read the Scriptures in the original. Add to all this the dark shadow of St. Augustine's cruel theology, then supreme, and we have enough to account for the adoption of a harsher and narrower creed as to the future life, by the Church in general. But this creed was *mercy itself compared* with our modern traditions, leaving as it did a door of hope widely open beyond the grave, to all but a very few exceptionally great sinners within the Church's pale."—*Ibid.* p. 109.

[†] Yet might this dogma never be compared with the tenets of an ignorant and popular Protestantism which out-Augustines Augustine. For purgatory in the official creed was the lot of every one who did not die in open revolt against God. Although such pictures as Dante's were tacitly permitted, yet they never represented the authorised Church teaching—pace Cardinal Manning, who styles Dante "the master-poët of the Catholic faith." So that for long (or perhaps always), in the Roman Catholic Communion, hell was for the thoughtful a theory rather than an entity; *e.g.*, the Church has never presumed to say of *any one*, "He has gone to hell," while the thing practically believed was and is purgatory. But that is not everybody's opinion It would not seem to be the opinion of the reviewer of Dante's *Divina Commedia* in the *Spectator* of May 21, 1887, who can write as follows: "The number and terror and foulness of the tortures (in hell) shock easy-going folks, who have never known remorse or felt the degradation of sin as the great Scriptural writers felt it, and whose horror of it is re-echoed by Dante; but it is notable that in the *Inferno* none complain of their punishment (the italics are mine), *each knowing that he has found his allotted place in the great harmony of God's law.*" In fine, according to the reviewer's idea, the prevailing feeling in hell will be a sort of "Rest, and be thankful."

This most uncatholic dogma did little enough in the way of checking wickedness; rarely has it proved effective for that: it was chiefly powerful for evil;‡ for thanks to it, brightness and gladness were in large measure banished from the Almighty's service, children could no longer look up with smiles in absolute trust and love to their heavenly Father, and the hearts of God's true servants, even when personally they anticipated rather purgatory than hell, were afflicted. Fear occupied the place of love. A grovelling attitude was called forth towards our heavenly Father. Abject was and is the apprehension of many Christians lest, in spite of well-nigh life-long service, they should incur terrific punishment, if not offend past forgiveness an implacable Deity. Can that be Christianity? Almost nobler may they seem who ask, Can the everlasting Tormentor of His fallen and unrepentant creatures be worthy of a free soul's service? Surely, every Christian heart will admit, though not without anguish, that *no God* would be better than an unjust and cruel God. And, were not this tradition, which I am denouncing, the lie of lies, we might look to see the inevitable outcome of a generous and righteous indignation. Yes, I say it with all the warmth of a Christian heart, we might look to see the Almighty forsaken by all save a few sycophants and flatterers, assuredly by all His noblest creatures, whether men or angels. He might then reign in solitude—not as He will be "All in all" but—God above, and universal hell beneath. But oh, even as I speak these not too daring words, since they are prompted by boundless faith and trust, I associate myself in spirit with the four-and-twenty elders who fall down before the throne, saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power; for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created."*

And even now, God be praised, the huge idol of never-ending woe and sin seems tottering to its fall. Soon, as we dare to trust, the tradition of the elders as to an endless hell shall be swept away amid the Hosannas of angels and of men. Already he who names that tradition with approval, apologises and equivocates. Glorious are the consequences which shall ensue when the tradition shall be overthrown by Christians acting for Christ their Master. Art will then no longer be divorced, as in a measure it has been, from God and Christ. Science will no longer be accounted of as something outside the Christian's concern. The poet's lays will no longer ask falteringly, "Is there any hope?"[*] The sense of futility, of worthlessness, of unprofitableness, in all that tends to human happiness, will cease to oppress the heart and brain. Grief and anguish, when they come, will only deepen trust. And, best of all, the icy barrier between our hearts and God will be removed, with the happy result that our love will flow forth unchecked towards God and man. We shall look up to God with hearts that are at rest. His chastisements in the world to come, even such as are most terrible, being those of a Father and remedial, will not shock our moral sense. And Christians will no longer be maddened by Christian men's presentment of their God. Lord Tennyson's riper thought will then be echoed by all—is it not widely echoed already?—that the God of love and the God of hell are unimaginable together.[†]

---

* And just because of the excellence of Christianity are its corrupt forms horrible: "Corruptio optimi pessima." As regards the follow-my-leader instincts of the majority of men, I have nothing to qualify.

† "Have you, who maintain the popular creed, ever quietly thought over the terrible slight you offer to the whole work of Christ, to His Incarnation and His Passion, by asserting the final loss of countless myriads of our race? He has come, we know, to save the world. He, the *Almighty One, very God of very God;* but you are never tired of proclaiming, in all your writings, in all your pulpits, His defeat!"—"Universalism Asserted," p. 262.

‡ Let me cite some remarkable words detailing the twenty years' experience of a Roman Catholic priest, and confessor to thousands: "The dogma of hell, except in the rarest cases, did no moral good. It never affected the right persons. It tortured innocent young women and virtuous boys. It appealed to the lowest motives, and the lowest characters. *It never, except in the rarest instances, deterred from the commission of sin,*" etc., etc.—R. Suffield, *Ibid.* p. 244.

"The chief objection which many earnest and devout minds entertain against the belief that pardon is possible in the world to come is that such a belief, if widely accepted, would do infinite moral mischief by encouraging multitudes to sin boldly, who are now deterred by the fear of hell. My own conviction is altogether opposed to this; for I am convinced that a vast quantity of sin is the practical outcome of the popular view."—Dr. Littledale, "Future Probation."

* Some men may not unfairly say, "Here, in this particular passage, is more of fervid rhetoric than of logical reasoning." And I partly think so, too. To say that the writer felt the passage deeply, is no complete excuse. In theory, an unchastened style is abhorrent to me; but alas for practice! The English, for theological purposes, that I delight in, is that of John Henry Newman, Richard Littledale, and James Wayland Joyce, my friend and near neighbour. What unadorned strength is there in the first; what inexorable logic, what a calm and judicial tone in the second; what perfection of form, what rapier thrusts, what trained acumen, what flashes of indignation expressed with all imaginable courtesy, in the third. But there is no imitating these noble styles. I can but speak as I feel, and I know not always how to preserve patience when devout and learned men lament calmly that any should be so obstinate as to resent infinite torture and sinfulness. Archer Gurney, when rebutting the charge of holding extreme views directed against universalists (or what I will venture to call Catholics), brings a smile into a grim subject by speaking of "good men, who believe in infinite punishment for finite sin, posing as calm, impartial, moderate thinkers, who object to strong opinions, and prefer (as it should seem) to burn themselves or their friends quietly and moderately throughout all the ages."

And I appeal to you, my brethren—if your hearts are no longer under the veil—to break openly at once and for ever with this particular tradition of the elders, as your Lord broke with other traditions before you under different circumstances. Let no party ties bind you. Let no love of peace ensnare you. Take action for God. Our dear Master did not shrink from any fear of consequences, from deference to any amount of false authority; neither do you. Be the man.[‡] The effort need not cost you too dearly—and if it did! but it need not. Nothing heroic is demanded of us. Were we indeed in bigoted France, where Christian thinkers, even when most orthodox, are sternly silenced by ecclesiastical censure, where only the ravings of atheists are unrestrained, then indeed the effort to free ourselves from this tradition of the elders might prove above the power of all who dare not face a modern martyrdom, might seem too formidable, or if not that too hopeless, because almost certain to awaken no response. A Catholic-minded *layman* in France, who should thus bravely dare, might indeed come off with some worldly loss, some persecution from his own family, and—where that could be brought to bear—some degree of social effacement. But a devout and reverent member of the French *clergy*, who, by reverting to Catholic truth, should diverge ever so little from the narrow ultramontane standard, would assuredly—besides having to endure the finger of scorn—suffer the loss of his benefice, and too possibly also would undergo exclusion from the very exercise of his sacred office. For France is a land where bigotry on the one hand and infidelity on the other advance on straight hard lines, and where that "householder who should bring forth out of his treasure things new and old" would be quickly frowned down. And this I say, not as questioning the personal holiness of very many who minister and who worship at the altars of the Gallican Church, but as being aware that her Bishops are absolute "lords over God's heritage."[*] In our own dear Anglican Church, on the other hand, orthodox Christians who firmly hold the creeds are not gagged, but may speak aloud the convictions of their souls, and neither priest nor layman shall be seriously molested for so doing.[†] Our Bishops, as a rule, are true fathers in God, men of large culture and of a generous spirit. If anywhere, it is among devout women that here, as in France, bigotry may sometimes be found. But though I have said this, and will not unsay it, there comes to me a vision, which is not all a vision, but a thrice-blessed reality, of a great army of noble English churchwomen, whether in or out of sisterhoods, full of good sense, good labours, and good will. And what about the clergy, you may ask? and more especially the country clergy? for the town clergy commonly live and let live, and God be thanked we have not to reckon with the monkish orders.

---

[*] See Tennyson's poem, "The Vision of Sin."

[†] Lord Tennyson has passed beyond all mere questioning of God's mercy. See his dramatic lyric, entitled "Despair," in "Tiresias, and other Poems":—

> Were there a God as you say,
> His love would have power over hell till it utterly vanished away.
> Ah yet—I have had some glimmer, at times, in my gloomiest woe,
> Of a God behind all—after all—the great God for aught that I know;
> But the God of Love and of Hell together—they cannot be thought,
> If there be such a God, may the great God curse him and bring him to nought.

[‡] There are countless devout men to whom I would fain make appeal. And one distinguished theologian there is, pre-eminent for patristic learning, the author of "Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome," Dr. Littledale, whom I would fain thank for the weighty words he has already spoken against the tradition as to everlasting punishment. Simple student-priest though he be, his influence over the Church of England is rarely equalled. He is a very tower of strength, and thank God he does not stand alone.

[*] Conceive a French priest writing as I have written in this very sermon! The French Bishops would make mincemeat of him. See the example made of the Abbé Combalot by the Bishop of Orleans for presuming to criticise—as a good Catholic—a charge of the Archbishop of Paris. See Vol. II. of the "Life of Monseigneur Dupanloup," and more especially chapters vi. and vii. What an organising genius had that militant Bishop, saint of God, and despot!

[†] The Ritualists, to whom the Church of England is indebted for a wide-spread restoration of the beauty of holiness in the public worship of God, are the only actual victims of bigotry; and this because what men see impresses them more than what they fear. The terrorists are not the Bishops, but a few ultra-Protestant laymen.

> Segnius irritant animos dimissa per aures
> Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus.
> "Then he, tho' Miriam Lane had told him all,
> *Because things seen are mightier than things heard,*
> Staggerd'd and shook."
> —"Enoch Arden."

Well, for one thing, we, the country clergy, are as a rule what the peasant clergy of France[*] confessedly are not, I mean educated men and gently nurtured, keeping touch with the present and the past. We read and think, and are not without a certain width of sympathy. True, every now and then, we are said to go a little wild on some point of secondary importance. But take us for all in all, I dare to affirm that we are not bigots. I love my order. Assuredly our great Anglican Church is not the natural home of bigotry. And therefore, at the worst, we who set forth the unconquerable love of the Almighty, have little more to apprehend than some few buffets, and here and there a cold shoulder. I am ashamed to name such things. Where one spark of duty burns, shall not greater obstacles than these be faced? So again I say, brethren, if your minds are happily convinced, break joyously, gratefully, adoringly, with that tradition which by God's Providence was not permitted to effect a lodgment in the Nicene Creed, which Creed indeed implies the larger hope.[†]

But where violence might fail to intimidate, there no doubt love and reverence for the past may exercise a potent spell. It is a weighty argument with many that St. Augustine's teaching as to endless punishment, having been almost universally accepted by the Church, must be accounted Catholic. To the minds of English churchmen a convincing answer should be supplied by the following question: Was not the worship of the blessed Virgin and of the saints as widely accepted for many centuries? And what then? Is it therefore Catholic? But in spite of this, we may hear, as it were, the protest of those who are yet in bondage, a protest not without dignity, and thus it runs in a holy precept: "Guard that which is committed unto thee." Ay, truly, brethren, if it have a heavenly origin; but when, having no place in God's Word, or in the Church's most ancient creeds, or in the teaching of the early Christian Fathers, its practical origin can be traced to a man like St. Augustine, a man of powerful intellect, but deeply morbid about his own religious sensations and experiences, which last were not good, and too much occupied with self to care greatly for others;[*] when, moreover, what he taught dishonours our Maker—then that which has been so entrusted to us is surely more honoured in the breach than the observance. If I must choose between God's honour and St. Augustine's teaching, my choice is soon made. I grant it hard to differ from the good of many centuries, from learned doctors, and holy bishops, and self-denying priests, and a devout laity. Here lies the sting of the tradition. But these men—wise as they may have been in many respects—found themselves in a groove from which they dreamt not of escape. For them the question was not raised. With us it is otherwise. Shall we continue in a dull submission to that which insults our God? Alarmists may ask, If countless saints of God were wrong as to an endless hell, what of their teaching remains sure? Ah, brethren, that thought is a device of Satan. All remains sure that is based upon God's Word, and is shrined in Christendom's ancient Creeds. And you may not let seeming authority crush you. Beware lest our Lord reproach you, as of yore He reproached the Jews for "holding the tradition of the elders," and for "making the Word of God of none effect through your tradition." A very little of your Lord's moral courage is needed. Does your soul really shrink from breaking—for valid reasons—with this particular tradition of the elders? And can you believe that the blessed ones who are at peace in Paradise would wish you to prolong their involuntary error out of a mistaken respect for their memories? How then are you prepared to blame the reverent and affectionate Jew who shrinks from acknowledging that Messiah whom his forefathers rejected, lest he should claim to be wiser than they?

And why should Christian priests, the most saintly, any more than devout Jewish priests, enjoy immunity from grave error? Shall I recall to you for a moment the fearful scene at the assembly of the Sanhedrim or Great Council of the Jewish church and nation, wherein the actors were for the more part consecrated priests? And it is like that we should judge harshly if we set them all down indiscriminately as hypocrites, though many doubtless were so, if we denied to some at least among them a true though mistaken zeal for God's honour. Then said the high priest, "He hath spoken blasphemy . . . what think ye?" And the priests and most venerated teachers of God's ancient church made reply as with one voice, "He is worthy of death."

---

[*] The family of Mons. Vianney, the saintly Curé d'Ars, is described by his biographer, l'Abbé Alfred Monnin, as "une de ces honnêtes familles de cultivateurs, dans lesquelles se sont perpétuées les traditions du travail et de la prière, race forte et saine d'où sortent depuis plus de cinquante ans, la plupart de nos prêtres, de nos religieuses, et de nos soldats."—"Life of the Curé d'Ars." See Introduction, pages 1 and 2.

[†] We have the faith of the Church defined in two documents, of an authority in its kind quite unique and fundamental—the two Creeds, the Apostles', and that we call the Nicene. (The Athanasian Creed is no more inconsistent with the larger hope than the other two, since when it speaks of "everlasting," that term can mean no more than the Scriptural *aionios*, which it represents.) Rightly to estimate the weight of the testimony borne by the two most venerable Creeds, let us remember that in the second Great Ecumenical Council, where the Nicene Creed received its present shape, *St. Gregory of Nazianzus* presided. He it is who says:—"Christ loosed, by His blood, *all* who groan under Tartarean chains." Be it remembered further that the chief agent in the task of adding to the Nicene Creed the new clauses then adopted, and ending with the significant words, "*I believe in the life of the world to come*"—in the *life* and in nothing more—was *St. Gregory of Nyssa*, whose words show him to have been an unhesitating advocate of universal salvation. Here are some of his words: "Doubtless the evil are to look for great severity from the Judge; but after due curative treatment, and when the fire shall have destroyed all foreign matter, then the nature, even of these, shall improve by the copious nuture they receive, and at length they, too, shall regain the Divine impress." *De an. et resur.* What can be more significant of the belief of the Church in these primitive days?—"Universalism Asserted," p. 101 and 96. See references.

[*] O that some able and courageous theologian, endowed with insight into character, possessed also of the needful learning—some theological Thackeray, when most discerning willing to make large allowances—would, without fear or favour, examine the character of St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, as shown in his works and life, whilst crediting him with every good point that can be carried to his account!

And now let me ask, What if the most venerated priests of the Christian Church unconsciously insulted their Maker in their turn when they accepted the dogma of an endless hell? For see what that dogma led to. Give a passing thought to the horrible deeds which the Church of Christ has perpetrated in her Master's name. Are we bound to condemn her absolutely for cruelty? Nay, though the doers of those deeds, many of them, became in process of time hardened and indifferent to human suffering, yet may the Church in a true sense be said to have acted for the best, being moved by unhesitating belief in an endless hell. Give a thought to the burning of heretics, the wholesale religious massacres in France, the auto-da-fés in Spain, in the Netherlands, and elsewhere, no voice of priest or bishop in authority being raised in protest. Do you suppose that these persecutors were all of them inhuman wretches? Nay, some of them, it may be, were misguided saints of God.* And the point to which I wish to bring you is this: God does not preserve His saints from serious errors. It was the tradition which was to blame, the devilish tradition of an endless hell. And does all punishment disappear when that tradition dies? Nay, there remain God's fatherly if terrible chastisements, enduring for an age or for ages, but endurable because remedial, because gradually leading those who are subjected to them out of darkness into light.

It is a revolution, if you will, for which we plead, a revolution not of blood and fire but of mercy and justice; and yet it is rather a restoration than a revolution. For this is the primitive and Catholic faith, Pauline and Petrine, and that of St. John and of our Blessed Lord Himself, and of the first school of Christian theology, the Alexandrian, and of the first four centuries of faith and love.

Lord, Thy Word abideth,
And our footsteps guideth;
Who its truth believeth,
Light and joy receiveth.

To that Word, above all, we make appeal, as written in the original tongue * rather than to any tradition Jewish or Christian. No man can foresee all the consequences of this restoration, except that they will be thrice blest. When once this restoration shall have been accomplished, Christianity will enter upon a fresh age of life and action. Our Heavenly Father will be served because He is loved; and it will be our joy to trust Him. All Christendom, but if God wills our own dear Anglican Church first and foremost, will take to heart our Master's words, "The Son of Man is not come to destroy, but to save men's lives." Blessed shall every one be who helps forward this peaceful and heavenly revolution. Let me move, if it were but a finger, O my God, in this Thy sacred cause!

But I may be too hopeful. "When the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith (or the faith) on the earth?" The tradition which held Messiah to be a mighty earthly conqueror destroyed the Jewish Church and nation. God grant that the tradition of the Christian elders may not destroy in its turn the Church of Christ. There would seem to belong to the belief in an endless hell something of the fabled attraction of the serpent's jaws. So then it may die hard. And if it be persisted in, it needs no prophet to foretell that men's minds will be alienated from Christianity and from Christianity's Lord.

I will end, brethren, with some outspoken words of a brother: † "I could wish you to understand that we teach the absolute certainty of ultimate salvation for all as *the Catholic Faith*, the primitive tradition of the Apostolic Church (not a private opinion), based on scriptural authority, Alexandrian teaching, and essential right and reason."

---

* Note the enormous effect of a belief in endless pain in authorising the most fiendish cruelty, and that in every branch of life and morals. Cruelty becomes divine. Humanity is still reeling, tottering, bleeding from this accursed dogma. For even though half-dead at present, "the evil that traditions do lives after them."

* "No doubt many of you will be surprised—perhaps even astonished and indignant—to hear that neither of these words, "hell" and "damnation," is to be found in any part of the New Testament, or indeed in any part of the whole Bible; nor even any word that at all answers to the conception which they quicken in our minds."—Dr. Samuel Cox in "Salvator Mundi." Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

"A fact of the deepest significance is this, that although many terms and phrases existed by which the idea of unendingness might have been conveyed, yet none of these is applied by our Lord and His Apostles to the future punishment of the impenitent. Thus *aidios* or *ateleutetos*, a stronger word, is never used of future punishment—*i.e.*, of punishment after the Day of Judgment—in the New Testament. Nor is it anywhere said to be *aneu telos*, "without end," nor do we read that it shall go on *pantote*, or *eis* to *dienekes*, "for ever."—"Universalism Asserted," p. 167.

The statement in St. Jude's Epistle, that the fallen angels shall be reserved in everlasting chains (*desmois aidiois*), is no exception to the above rule, since they shall but be so reserved "unto the judgment of the great day."

Let me add this testimony, as regards the Old Testament, from Dr. Stanley Leathes, *vide* "Future Probation," p. 4: "There is no word in the Hebrew language, or at least the language of the Old Testament, which expresses the mediæval and modern idea of hell as a place of torment.

† The Rev. Archer Gurney. Extract from a letter of the same to his brother: "What must differentiate our teaching from that of Maurice, Jukes, and many others, is that we must lay down the ultimate triumph of God and good as *the Faith once delivered to the saints*."

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials FREE OF CHARGE may be had on application to Medical Battery Co. Ld.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1887.

FIGHT FOR YOUR COUNTRY.—HOW?

OVER one of the gateways in the great quadrangle of Trinity College, Cambridge, there is a figure of the warlike monarch, Edward III., with the inscription, "Fight for your country." This was doubtless intended as a stimulus to those amongst the students who might be looking forward to a military career as their possible, or probable, destiny in life. But happily it is a precept which may also be interpreted in a higher sense than that originally contemplated by those who placed it there. It may justly point to every form of patriotic citizenship by which a man can serve his native land and the world at large, and especially to those noble actions and endeavours by which the religious, social, and philanthropic interests of mankind are best promoted. To the youths who propose to devote themselves to the ministry of the Gospel, to science, the healing art, law, and magistracy, or commerce and manufacture, to all of these, the motto, "Fight for your country," or in other words, "Combat its enemies of impiety, ignorance, disorder, and poverty," is more truly applicable than to the military aspirant; for in such modes of national service consists the truest patriotism.

There is scarcely a word in any language, the true sense of which is more systematically misrepresented and misunderstood than the term patriotism. It is often made synonymous with silly braggadocio, political foolhardiness, and selfish disregard of the rights of other men or other nations. Not unseldom it is made to cover an unreasoning vanity. The peace of Europe is being continually imperilled because large and influential classes amongst the peoples of France, Germany, and Russia cherish such an extreme sensitiveness as to their military *prestige*, that they are willing to sacrifice all the most important interests of their respective countries, and to incur the most tremendous risks of ruin and bloodshed, rather than endure a slight in regard to their prowess as warriors.

It was not a wise course on the part of Germany to insist on the cession of Alsace-Lorraine by France. Prince Bismarck attempted to dissuade his colleagues from this step, but even he was overruled by the military party in their short-sighted policy. But this step having been consummated, it would have been honourable to France to devote her energies thenceforth to the development of her vast remaining resources of peaceful wealth and industry. No doubt the loss of the two Provinces must be a galling reminiscence; it would be affectation to attempt to disguise this; and if, by any sensible means, such as the purchase of Alsace and Lorraine from Germany at a price which would be high enough to tempt the victor to accept it, the national susceptibilities of the French could be honourably vindicated, without further ruin and massacre, the result would be a most desirable one. But it is no patriotism for Frenchmen to adopt such a policy of armed menace as will endanger, or even render ultimately certain, the awful national scourge of a second conflict between the two great Powers. The recapture of Alsace and Lorraine, at such a cost, even if successfully accomplished, would be a foolish sacrifice of higher national interests.

The real wisdom, the true patriotism, of Germany and France alike, would be manifest in some united action, either to arrange for the repurchase of Alsace-Lorraine by France, or in a stipulation for a mutual reduction of armaments, on a large scale, and for a provision of some standing Court of impartial Arbitration, to which any disputes between the two peoples might be committed for mutually honourable decision.

But instead of some such sensible course, it is sad and humiliating to observe, on both sides of the Rhine, a determination to reject conciliatory and reasonable means of settling mutual difficulties, and to rely alone on the awful hazards of brute force—blood and iron. It is too painfully obvious to travellers on the Continent, that patriotism, in its highest sense, is little known in either France or Germany. As it was in the comparatively Dark Ages, when Edward III. was king, so now, there seems to be no other idea of fighting for one's country but by sword and cannon—or, in short, by butchery. This is the ultimate outcome of the sham chivalry of modern France and of the merely brutal *zeitgeist* of Germany. In both countries the authorities and prevalent public opinion usually forbid meetings for the promotion of pacific and wise international conciliation. A few brave men and women, here and there, on either side of the Rhine, venture to advocate such means, but the general weight of authority and feeling in both countries is directed heavily and scornfully against them.

And what is, perhaps, the most lamentable thing of all, is that in neither country does the professing Christian Church take any decided step to oppose this iniquity and folly. As a body, the Catholic priests and the Protestant pastors, and even the once peace-loving Mennonites, are almost indistinguishable from the avowed atheists amongst their countrymen. And, alas, it is amongst some of the latter, rather than the former, that both in France and Germany are to be found the minority, whose voices and wishes incline towards a wise conciliation, or just and timely compromise, in regard to international rivalries. Professing Christendom, on the Continent, is little influenced by true and Scriptural patriotism.

THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Vicar of Warrenpoint, Ireland.

(*Continued from page* 152.)

II. Origin of Brethrenism.

In the year 1829 there was in Dublin a small knot of men sincerely desirous to promote Christian unity and spirituality in religion. Of these, Mr. A. N. Groves, who had been a dentist at Exeter, but was at the time we speak of a student in the Divinity School, Trinity College, Dublin, was the leading spirit. Meetings were held for prayer and fellowship, and at first the promoters seem to have contemplated nothing further than the mutual edification of those who met together on the broad basis of Christian Union. Very soon, however, the question, What is truth? began to be debated. Those who started as witnesses for the truth, speedily proceeded to protest against error. They made, too, a very decided advance at an early period of their existence by introducing at their meetings the custom of "breaking bread" every Lord's Day in commemoration of the dying injunction of our blessed Saviour. Mr. Groves set out for Bagdad in 1829 on a missionary tour with the celebrated Dr. Kitto, and when he returned in 1836, he found Brethrenism established as a distinct organisation. While this movement was going forward in Ireland, a somewhat similar one was in progress in England. It was indeed a time of religious awakening. The minds of many men were beginning to emancipate themselves from the dull routine and formalism which, like the grasp of a dead hand, paralysed all Christian energy in the Church of God. Already the current of that religious awakening which culminated in Tractarianism was stirring the stagnant waters of the Church of England. Everywhere men stretched forth hands that groped, often feebly, often blindly, but anxiously and hopefully, for some guidance into clearer light, for some help to lead a better and a higher life. About 1831 the same causes which had led to the formation of the Dublin Society led to the establishment of a similar society in Plymouth.

In Plymouth the principal persons were Mr. B. W. Newton, a Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford; Mr. Tregelles, Mr. Soltau, Mr. Wigram, and Mr. Harris. Mr. Newton held the office of presiding elder, and the Brethren at Plymouth seem to have had a strong tendency towards some kind of ecclesiastical system, resembling a modified Presbyterianism, but when the subject was brought forward for discussion, the Irish Brethren decided that they "would not be over-ruled by the Plymouth Brethren," a saying which perhaps had something to do with the designation that has since, sorely against their will, clung to the sect. The Irish society received, in 1832, an adherent destined very soon to take a prominent place in the new system. Rev. John Nelson Darby, a clergyman of the Church of Ireland, seceded from the Church and joined the Dublin Brethren. A third branch of the sect, independent of those already mentioned, had meantime started up at Bristol, where Messrs. Müller and Craik presided in the Bethesda Chapel, a name of evil omen in the annals of the sect. When Mr. Groves returned, in 1836, the change which had taken place in the principles and practices of the Brethren filled him with alarm. Like many excellent men, he had yet to learn that it is easier to set such a movement going, than to control it when once it has been set in motion. Those who knew Mr. Groves intimately revered him highly. Dr. Kitto, who never had any connection with Brethrenism, said of him, "In the whole world, so far as I know it, there is not one man whose character I venerate so highly." Some idea of the rapid change which the system passed through during the first seven years of its existence, may be learned from the letter which Mr. Groves addressed to Darby. He says: "I feel it needs but a step or two more to advance, and you will see all the evils of the systems from which you profess to be separated to spring up among yourselves. The transition your little bodies have undergone in no longer standing forth the witnesses for the glorious and simple truth so much as standing forth witnesses against all that they judge error, has lowered them in my apprehension from heaven to earth in their position of witnesses."

The result foreseen by Mr. Groves speedily came to pass. The Brethren held peculiar views as to the second Advent of Christ. The interpretation of prophecy had always entered largely into their system. Mr. Darby held a secret coming of the Lord and the rapture of the saints before the manifestation of Antichrist, whilst Mr. Newton placed the second Advent after the development of Antichrist. In a matter shrouded in uncertainty one would naturally expect that members of the same community who had denounced with bitter denunciations the divisions of Christendom might at least find some modus vivendi without pushing the quarrel to extremity, but, strange as it may appear, an *eirenicon* could not be found.

In 1845 Mr. Newton made an effort to lay down some basis of doctrine for the Brethren by publishing certain theological propositions. Mr. Darby's adherents retaliated by dragging into light some unguarded expressions made use of by Mr. Newton in a paper on the humanity of Christ. It mattered nothing that the objectionable statements had been made ten years previously, that they had adopted the views themselves and circulated them without protest for ten years, that Mr. Newton withdrew the expressions, and frankly admitted their misleading tendency. Mr. Darby's party would accept no compromise, and the society was split into hostile sections in 1847. The Bristol Brethren, when called on by the Darbyites to excommunicate the followers of Mr. Newton, refused to do so, and they also were cut off from the fold. Henceforward the secessionists looked on the Müllerites as "the Bethesda blasphemy," and do not hesitate to call the members "Bristol blasphemers."

The Exclusive Brethren, as the Darbyites are called, will receive under certain conditions members of other religious denominations, but they exclude to the present hour with rigid severity the members of the Bristol and kindred societies.

It would be an error to suppose that this feud exhausted the separative element among the Brethren. In 1866 Captain Percy Hall and many more, including Mr. Dorman, separated from the Darbyites on account of erroneous views taught by Mr. Darby respecting the sufferings of our Lord.

The following is a fair illustration of their plan of evangelisation :—

The Rev. W. T. Latimer, a Presbyterian minister in Ulster, says: "When the Brethren begin to work in any district, they are at first very careful to conceal their peculiar doctrines and their religious denomination. They teach a little truth to lead men to much error. If asked whether they are Plymouthists they will positively deny they bear that name—will state they are just Christians, and that their great object is to unite together believers in Christ. They will assert that they have no idea of establishing a new sect, or of taking people away from their own place of worship. But after they have made an impression, and have obtained a guiding influence over a few, then they will throw off the mask and tell their followers "to come out from among them," that is, to withdraw from the Church to which they belong—whatever it may be—to submit to be rebaptised by immersing the whole body in water, and afterwards to worship only with the Brethren on the pain of excommunication if they attend the services of another denomination."*

Lord Congleton, one of the Brethren, but not a Darbyite, bears the following testimony : "Have you tried these Brethren—the Darbyites. I have tried them (try the spirits whether they are of God) and found them false prophets—in every sense of the word false. They are false in what they say of their brethren, they are false in doctrine, and they are false in their walk.'

Mr. Howard, a gentleman connected from the beginning with Brethrenism, describes the Darbyites as "restless innovators, cradled in fanaticism and fostered in hypocrisy."

Such is a brief sketch of the origin and progress of this curious schism. It is true that some of the members are simple-minded, devout, and holy Christians; but it is also true that no body of schismatics have departed more widely in practice from the original design of the founders, that nowhere else can be found more arrogance, more unprofitable intrusions into things not revealed, more spiritual pride, more self-assertion and sectarianism, than among the Exclusive Brethren. The Open Brethren are less aggressive, and if they have fallen into many errors, they show at least more of the spirit of meekness than the more numerous class constituting the submissive disciples of John Nelson Darby.

We shall proceed in the next place to consider the peculiar views of the Brethren.*

III.—OPINIONS OF THE BRETHREN.

THE opinions of the Brethren are as varied and as conflicting as could have been expected from the history of the sect. There is hardly any doctrine of the Christian faith respecting which these erratic teachers have not erred, and in spite of their claim to possess Divine illumination, the profession of a belief on any point by one seems enough to make others call it in question. Here is what A. E. E. says in "The Salvation of God," vol. 9, No. 97, on "Grace, Possession and Enjoyment."

"These three truths seem shown in Deuteronomy xxxiii. 23, and Joshua i. 3, 15.

"'Satisfied with favour, and full with the blessing of the Lord : possess thou.' (Deut. xxxiii. 23) 'Every place that the sole of your foot shall tread upon.' (Joshua i. 3.) 'And enjoy it.' (*v.* 15.)

"It is only when a soul learns God's favour or grace that it gets satisfied and full with the blessing. If something is done for one who is utterly unworthy, it is impossible for that person through want of worthiness to lose what he or she has received. This gives 'rest.'"

Compare, in opposition to this teaching, Matt. xxiv. 50, 51 ; xxv. 28 ; 1 Cor. viii. 11 ; ix. 27 ; Rev. ii. 5 ; and, again, W. H. S. says :

"But this is the truth, and God will never lay anything to the charge of those who have believed in Jesus, nor *will He ever judge them for their sins.* On that shed blood is founded His offer of salvation to sinners such as you and I, my reader, who, if we had our deserts, would be in hell this moment ; and it rests with yourself whether you will take the place of a lost and ruined sinner before God, and accept salvation upon His terms ; for the Redeemer has so perfectly accomplished *His* work that all *you* have to do is to believe on Him, AND THOU SHALT BE SAVED."

Here are the views of Geo. C. on "Safety, Certainty, and Enjoyment :"

"Now you must bear in mind that every saved one has still with him 'the flesh,' *i.e*, the evil nature he was born with as a natural man, and which perhaps showed itself while he was still a helpless infant on his mother's lap. The Holy Ghost in the believer resists the flesh, and is *grieved* by every activity of it in motive, word, or deed. When he is walking 'worthy of the Lord,' the Holy Ghost will be producing in his soul His blessed fruits—'love, joy, peace,' etc. See Gal. v. 22. When he is walking in a carnal, worldly way the Spirit is grieved, and these fruits are wanting in greater or less measure."

"Dear reader, however weak your faith may be rest assured of this, that the *blessed One* who has won your confidence will never change.

---

* "A Lecture on the Doctrines of Plymouth Brethren," by the Rev. W. T. Latimer, B.A. Belfast : Cleeland & Co. Edinburgh ; James Gemmell.

* Those interested in this subject can examine, as sources of information for the origin of Brethrenism : "Plymouth Brethrenism," *Quarterly Review*, Oct. 30, 1873 ; reprinted ; Hodder & Stoughton. "Plymouth Brethrenism," by E. J. Whately ; London : Hatchards, 1879 ; reprinted from the *Christian Observer*, Nov. and Dec., 1876. "Darbyism, or the Separatist Theory of a Pure Church," by the Rev. Thomas Croskery ; London : Nisbet & Co.

"'Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and FOR EVER.' Heb. xiii.

"*The work* He has accomplished will never change.

"'Whatsoever God *doeth* it shall be FOR EVER: nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it.' Eccles. iii. 14.

"The *word* He has spoken will never change.

"The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: but the word of the Lord endureth FOR EVER.' 1 Peter i. 24, 25.

"Thus the *object of my trust*, *the foundation of my safety*, and the *ground of my certainty*, are alike ETERNALLY UNALTERABLE."

. . . .

Plymouthists, if not fatalists, seem to verge closely on it. The same writer says (*ibid.*)—

"Don't imagine, however, that the judgment of God falls a whit more leniently on the believer's sin than on the unbeliever's. He has not two ways of dealing judicially with sin, and He could no more pass by the believer's sin without judging it, than He could pass by the sins of a rejector of His precious Son. *But there is* this *great difference* between the two; *viz., that the believer's sins were all known to God*, and all laid upon His own provided Lamb when He hung upon the cross at Calvary, and that there and then, once and for ever, the great '*criminal question*' of his guilt was raised and settled, judgment falling upon the blessed Substitute in the believer's stead, 'Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree.'" 1 Peter ii. 24.

Surely we are entitled to ask, Were the sins of the unbeliever not known to God also?

The same writer says—

"My spiritual joy will be in proportion to the spiritual character of my walk after I am saved.

"Now do you see your mistake? You have been mixing up *enjoyment* with your *safety*, two widely-different things. When, through self-indulgence, loss of temper, worldliness, etc., you grieved the Holy Spirit, and lost your joy, you thought your safety was undermined. But again I repeat it—

"*Your safety hangs upon Christ's work* FOR *you.*

"*Your assurance upon God's word* TO *you.*

"*Your enjoyment upon your not grieving the Holy Ghost* IN *you.*"

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE CHURCH OF IRELAND'S CATECHISM.

SIR,—The second paragraph of the Preface to the Church of Ireland Prayer Book is, "As concerning the Holy Communion, some of our brethren were at first earnest that we should remove from the Prayer Book certain expressions, which they thought might seem to lend some pretext for the teaching of doctrine concerning the presence of Christ in that sacrament, repugnant to that set forth in the Articles of Religion, wherein it is expressly declared that the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and that the means whereby it is received and eaten is Faith; but, upon a full and impartial review, we have not found in the Formularies any just warrant for such teaching, and therefore, in this behalf, we have made no other change than to add to the Catechism one question, with an answer taken out of the twenty-eighth of the said Articles." The added question and answer are: "After what manner are the Body and Blood of Christ taken and received in the Lord's Supper?" "Only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the means whereby they are taken and received is Faith."

Your correspondent says that the above paragraph of the Preface contains an absolute falsehood (I cite his letter in PULPIT, 20th August). In his letter of the 24th September, he says, "the plain fact is, that in the new Preface it is said, 'we have added a question, with an answer taken out of the 28th Article." "These words, and this punctuation are not in the Preface." Whether your correspondent has wilfully, or through inadvertence, placed a comma, not to be found in the original, at *answer*, I do not know. If through inadvertence, all that this shows is, that he is unable to understand the construction of sentences; for this comma is the thing wanted to give the sentence a meaning that does not belong to it, which meaning it is constructed to exclude, but which meaning is that upon which the false accusation of falsehood is based.

Your correspondent goes on to repeat things about the report of Master Brooke's Committee. That Report is one thing, and the Preface is another thing. "All was done for a purpose." I suppose it was; the purpose being "to make the Prayer Book as perfect as possible." To mix up the Report with the Preface is the common red-herring trick. He asks why the Preface is not worded so and so. It is not worded as he suggests because it would not come into any sensible man's head to word it so.

My accusations of impudence, dishonesty, and falsehood, against your correspondent, do touch the point; in fact they are the point. I am not discussing this matter, or any matter, with him; I am exposing him, knowing as I do that various slanders directed against the Church of Ireland are current, and I never meet them that I do not make some attempt to answer or expose them. I presume that there will be no further need for me to remark in your columns on slanders by a person who misquotes documents to sustain his slander.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

September 24th, 1887.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words in reply to my dear friend Mrs. Marshall?

1. What I said, I say again, that those who, in *The Church Times* and *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, say that all that remains of the bread is "the *species*," and that this complies only with the requirement of the Catechism, that there should be two parts in a Sacrament. Those who say this contradict the Catechism and the Communion Service, "these Thy creatures."

2. Those who pretend that our Lord's body may be in ninety places at once, go against the 4th and 11th Articles, as well as the Black Rubric.

3. I am well aware of Sir R. Phillimore's judgment, but the Privy Council reversed this, and hesitated to

condemn Mr. Bennett's adoration as idolatrous, merely because he might possibly mean only to adore the omnipresent second person of the Trinity.

4. Mrs. Marshall says that if we explain what we believe, "all mystery is at end." But, if a man "believes he knows not what," how can he give a reason for the hope that is in him, as the Apostle says he ought?

5. Mrs. Marshall says she claims no more than this, that our Lord's body is present by effects, as the Sun is in my room or garden. But *this*, her oracles, *The Church Times*, and the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, denounce as heretical.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

SIR,—I need no instruction or authority from "Judex" or *The English Churchman* to confirm me on the reason and duty of worshipping what Canon Crosthwaite most properly calls "The mysterious *Presence* in the Holy Eucharist." *The English Churchman* was not forwarded to me, so how could I know anything about the masterpiece of argument formulated by your correspondent? *Judex locutus est, causa finita est.* Canon Crosthwaite forwarded to me his letter in your impartial journal, which accounts for the renewal of my "buzz!" My letters were, indeed, a mere buzzing when compared with the snarling, growling, and snapping of a host of ignorant, over-bearing Protestants, who agreed with one another in vituperating, and trying to browbeat into silence those who dare dispute their new-fangled doctrine of a real *absence* in the Holy Eucharist. "Judex" acknowledges that I have gained "all my soul longed for," and forced the Canon "to give in." I believe that we substantially agreed all the time. It is sad to see the "Calm retreat," dear to the sensitive nerves of "Judex," so roughly broken in upon by other offenders besides me; *e.g.*, the epithets "impudence, dishonesty, falsehood," being hurled at "Even-handed Justice" by W. Lawrence. Let "Judex" persevere in his laudable endeavours to "make a solitude (of his own opinions), and call it peace."

SOPHIA J. MARSHALL.

◆

ON St. Matthew's Day, at Wells Cathedral, the Bishop admitted to the diaconate Mr. Gordon J. H. Llewellyn, who was afterwards licensed to the curacy of Yeovil. Mr. Llewellen had for the last nine years been the minister of the so-called "Reformed Episcopal Church" in Yeovil, but had returned with most of the congregation to the Church of England.

WE are not long left in suspense as to the candidates for the Lady Margaret Professorship, at Cambridge. Canon Luckock, of Ely, has definitely decided to come forward, and his candidature will be welcomed by those who desire to have provision made for the teaching of theology in its bearing on pastoral work. He was for several years a divinity lecturer both at his own college (Jesus) and at King's; and his experience as first Principal of the successful theological college at Ely renders him a strong candidate. It is also said that Dr. H. B. Swete, of Caius, Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London, will probably stand. He also has had experience of teaching both in Cambridge and elsewhere, and his edition of "Theodore of Mopsuestia" and other works have deservedly taken a high place in recent theological literature. It is also known that Dr. Hort has consented to become a candidate; the precedent for promoting a professor to a position of greater *status* and emolument was set when the Bishop of Durham vacated the Hulsean Professorship, and it was strengthened when the late Dr. Swainson went up from the Norrisian chair. Whether it is a good system or a bad one, there can be no doubt that a scholar of Dr. Hort's eminence has quite exceptional claims to the most influential position and the largest emoluments which the University can offer. It would have been more graceful if this promotion could have been accorded without a contest, if it is to be given at all; but this cannot now be the case. The Graduates in Divinity are so scattered throughout the country and so little known to residents here that the result of the election is involved in much greater obscurity than it would be if the decision rested with a body of electors on the spot.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Byrchmore, Rev. J., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Duddeston; Vicar of Tickenham, near Clevedon.

Dixon, Rev. Robert, M.A., LL.D., Vicar of Aylesbeare, Devon.

Fisher, Rev. Robert, Vicar of Arundel, Sussex.

Hargrove, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Vicar of Silsoe, Beds; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Cambridge.

Hird, Rev. James Dennis, M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Battersea; Organising Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society for the Diocese of London.

Miller, Rev. A. J., M.A., Vicar of Middleton, near Leeds; Rector of Wootton, Northampton.

Mills, Rev. C. C., Curate of Clapham Parish Church; Chaplain of Cuddesdon College.

Raymond, Rev. Charles Andrewes, Rector of St. Mary's, Wallingford; Vicar of Bray, Berks.

Smithson, Rev. John Edward, B.A., Vicar of Lowesby, Leicestershire.

Straton, Rev. Balfour, Curate-in-Charge of St. Catherine's District Church, Belle Vue, in the parish of Sandal Magna, Yorkshire.

Sutcliffe, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Castle Hall, Stalybridge; Surrogate for the Diocese of Chester.

Symonds, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Rector of St. Thomas's, Stockport; Surrogate for the Diocese of Chester.

Tuck, Rev. Julian George, Senior Curate of Bucknall, Stoke-on-Trent; Rector of Tostock, Bury St. Edmund's.

Wake, Rev. Archibald James, M.A., Rector of Courteenhall, Northamptonshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Andrews, Rev. William, B.D., late Fellow and Sub-Rector of Exeter College, Oxford, and for thirty-three years Rector of Great Somerford, Wilts, on the 24th ult., aged 75 years.

Drury, Rev. William, Vicar of Kirk Braddan, at Braddan Vicarage, Isle of Man, on the 19th ult., aged 79.

Du Pré, Rev. Henry Ramus, Rector of Shellingford, Berks, on the 25th ult., aged 76.

Jones-Machen, Rev. J. E., Rector of Llanthewy, Vach, Mon., on the 20th ult., aged 56 years.

Latham, Rev. Frederick, Vicar of Helpringham, at Helpringham, on the 17th ult., aged 74.

Odell, Rev. Arthur Cox, seventh son of the late J. Odell, Esq., J.P., of Coventry, and late Curate of St. Margaret's, Leicester, at Radford Road, Coventry, on the 12th ult.

Oliver, Rev. William, M.A., formerly of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, Vicar of Hadnall, and Minister-in-Sole-Charge of Christ Church, Needwood Forest, on the 17th ult., aged 73.

Prichard, Rev. Richard, B.D., of Collenna, Glamorgan, for forty-three years Rector of Newbold-on-Stour, Rural Dean of Kineton South, at Newbold-on-Stour, on the 20th ult., aged 76.

Schönberg, Rev. Moritz., formerly Vicar of St. Peter's, Warrington, at Christ Church Rectory, Denton, on the 18th ult., in his 77th year.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CHURCH EXPANSION.

By the Lord Bishop of DURHAM.

Sermon preached before the Wolverhampton Church Congress, on Monday, October 3rd, 1887.

"He shall set up an ensign for the nations."—Isaiah xi. 12.

A YEAR memorable in the annals of England is fast waning. The "golden wedding" of sovereign and people—symbolised by the coronation ring—has been celebrated with due pomp. While the splendour of the pageant was still floating before our eyes, we gathered up the lessons which the event has bequeathed to us, as Englishmen.

In this valuable legacy, among much that we have learnt besides, the one prominent idea, which impressed all thoughtful minds, was the imperial destiny of England—her world-wide interests and responsibilities. This lesson has done something, let us hope, to counteract our insular narrowness. It has rescued our patriotism from degenerating into a disguised selfishness. Our watchword hereafter must be *Humani nihil alienum*, not only as men, but as Englishmen. No statesman henceforth will deserve the name, who does not give to this idea a prominent place in shaping his policy.

The history of the present reign is an emphatic enunciation of this idea. It is not only that the English race and the English language have spread far and wide, penetrating into every continent and sweeping every sea; but that, so spreading, our colonists and fellow-countrymen never forget their English origin. There is dispersion and yet there is unity. The centripetal force acts simultaneously with the centrifugal, and regular, energetic motion is the result. The limited extent and insular position of the mother country, the spirit of adventure and the exceptional fecundity of the race—these are the elements which make up the centrifugal force. The stubborn tenacity and the home fondness of the English heart, the conservatism (in the best sense) of the English character—here is the regulating centripetal attraction.

This lesson has been pressed upon us from many quarters. One writer has set before us the expansion of England as the great factor in the recent history of the world; another has taught us to regard our empire as the translation into fact of the old poetic fable of Atlantis, the counterpart of the ideal commonwealth of Oceana beyond the seas. It has not only been dinned into our ears. It has been brought vividly before our eyes by many impressive displays. The wealth of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition was followed by the representative pageant of the Jubilee. The lesson of the Jubilee is perpetuated in the foundation of the Imperial Institute.

But must we not look for some great spiritual counterpart to all this? Every great temporal epoch or crisis suggests corresponding religious opportunities. "Two worlds are ours," as citizens of a heavenly polity. Let us ask ourselves then what dominant thought this crisis suggests to us, as members of the Anglican Church. What is the great thought in the spiritual world which corresponds to this imperial conception of the destinies of England? In the extravagance of mediæval ideas the Holy Roman Empire was the counterpart to the Holy Roman Church. May we not from a more sober point of view arrive at a truer result?

Shall we not say then that our spiritual counterpart is the catholicity of the English Church, with all the responsibilities which it involves — the world-wide opportunities — the unique destiny which in God's providence seems to be reserved for the Anglican community in shaping the future of Christendom?

I referred just now to the *Expansion of England*, and I do not know how I could better introduce the subject for which I claim your attention than by quoting the language of this writer, though his point of view is quite different from my own:—"The same nation (he says) which reaches one hand towards the future of the globe and assumes the position of mediator between Europe and the New World, stretches the other hand to the remotest past, becomes an Asiatic conqueror, and usurps the succession of the Great Mogul. Never certainly did any nation since the world began assume anything like so much responsibility. Never did so many vast questions in all parts of the globe, questions calling for all sorts of special knowledge and special training, depend upon the decision of a single public. It must be confessed that this public bears its responsibility lightly. It does not even study Colonial and Indian questions. It does not consider them interesting, except in those rare cases when they come to the foreground of politics. When the fate of a Ministry is concerned, they are found intensely interesting, but the public does not consider them interesting so long as only the population of India, the destiny of a vast section of the planet, and the future of the English State itself are concerned." Make a few verbal changes in this paragraph; substitute the English Church for the English nation; and you have the lesson which I wish to enforce this afternoon. I am the more emboldened to make these substitutions and to appropriate this lesson to English Churchmen, because I do not think I should be doing great violence to the author's conceptions by this change. He himself is not indifferent—as indeed no true historian could be indifferent—to the co-relations between the political and the religious. "The Church," he writes, "so at least I hold, is the salvation of the State; where there is a Church a State grows up in time; but if you find a State which is not also in some sense a Church, you find a State which is not long for this world."

This mediatorial position which our author assigns to the English people—this close contact alike with the traditions of the past and the hopes of the future—this great storehouse containing treasures new and old, as in the Gospel parable—above all this world-wide interest in the welfare of divers nations and races—is it not eminently characteristic of the English Church? And if the description of character is appropriate, can we say that the sting of the reproach is undeserved? It must be confessed that these English Churchmen bear this responsibility lightly.

Nay, I do not doubt that I shall be reproached by many for losing a golden opportunity and wasting valuable time on an unprofitable theme. Would it not have been better to deal with some urgent practical question? There are many thousands of practical heathens in our midst, untouched by the message of the Gospel. How shall we reach them? There is this "Artisan Atheism," of which we have read so much. What methods can we devise for checking this? There is the "chaotic" state of discipline in the Church. Why not try to reduce this chaos to order? With scores of such perplexing practical problems crying for solution, is it not madness to chase a mere vision of a dream?

My answer is twofold. I do not allow that this subject has a merely sentimental interest. I believe that very tangible consequences will result from the proper handling of it. It is a narrow type of statesmanship—though the average man is slow to see this—which would have us confine our attention to developing our material resources at home and leave imperial and international questions to take care of themselves. Experience shows that not only our political relations to our colonies and dependencies, but our position in the community of nations, have an almost immediate effect on commerce and manufacture, and so on the material prosperity of the country. But the wider view is of much higher importance in things spiritual. The spiritual nerves are far more sensitive than the political and the commercial. The image of the sympathy between the different members of the body has here its highest realisation. The parish cannot afford to disregard its duties to the diocese, or the diocese to the Church of the nation, without suffering a partial paralysis. In like manner the Church of the nation impoverishes its inward resources and stints its spiritual growth unless it interests itself in the struggles, the hopes, and fears of the Churches without. Sympathy, like mercy, bears a twofold blessing, and the larger share falls to the giver. Sympathy repays itself a thousand-fold to a Church, as to an individual, in the capacities enlarged and the energies quickened in the sense of a keener and fuller life.

But, secondly, a great idea, kept steadfastly in view and guiding its actions, is a source of untold strength to a Church, as to a nation. Who can doubt that the presence of such an inspiration was the secret of the tough vitality of the Jewish people, the life-blood throbbing and thrilling through the veins of the nation? Listen to such passages as these:—"Behold thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not, and nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee, because of the Lord thy God and for the Holy One of Israel." "Behold, I will shake all nations, and the desirable things of all nations shall come, and I will fill this House with glory." "Spare not; lengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes; for thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left." "In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the peoples; to it shall the Gentiles seek; and his resting-place shall be glorious." "All ye inhabitants of the world and dwellers on the earth, see ye, when He lifteth up an ensign on the mountains."

How could they grow faint, how could they despair, how could they lie down and die, with this hope before them? Had not the Lord Jehovah Himself chosen them out from all the peoples of the earth, and reserved them for a signal destiny? Not Memphis or Thebes, not Nineveh or Babylon or Susa or Persepolis, not Athens or Alexandria or Rome, but Jerusalem was the true spiritual capital of the world, the centre of the hopes and interests of mankind. Here should be the rallying point of the nations of the earth. Hither should flow in the tribute from all quarters of the heavens, the richest treasures of every land and every clime.

I need not stop to consider how this inspiring vision was fulfilled—fulfilled far beyond their most splendid hopes, but fulfilled in a way unforeseen or but vaguely discerned even by the prophets themselves. I need not remind you how nations whom they knew not—peoples like the Greeks and Romans, then only dimly descried on the horizon of history—peoples like the Gauls and Britons and Teutons and Sclaves, of whose very names they were ignorant—did rally round this ensign of the Lord, did gather at the call of the divine Voice, did contribute their choicest gifts and endowments to the building and adorning of the spiritual Sion. No study is more instructive than this; but it is beside my purpose now. I desire only to ask your attention to this dominant idea, as a quickening, sustaining, energising force in the life of the Jewish people. No nation since the beginning of time has survived so many and such terrible disasters. Crushed, enslaved, trampled under foot, battered between contending foes, bandied to and fro by rival empires, carried away into captivity, they have started up again and again into vigorous life. Not once only was the prophet's vision of the dry bones realised in the resurrection of this people, Not once only was the Apostle's paradox of language translated into fact in their strange eventful history: "As dying, and behold we live"—live to hand down the priceless treasure to generations unborn—live in the hopes and fears of the human family—live in the thoughts which shall mould the hearts of men to the end of time.

And may we not say without presumption that a somewhat analogous destiny seems to be reserved for the English Church? The one great fact, indeed, which is the pivot of all history, cannot be repeated. The Incarnation of the Son of God, enshrined in the records of a people, must remain unique. But is there not a sense in which it may be said that God sets up His standard in this English Church; that it seems to be marked out by His hand as a rallying point of the nations; and that here is the most hopeful centre for the unity of Christendom, if such unity has any place in His counsels? History is our prophet. God's voice speaks with no uncertain sound in the records of our nation and Church. Have we ears to hear? He throws down the gauge. Have we faith and courage to take it up and to translate His offer into fact?

This is the one thought which I desire to leave on your minds to-day. You are met together here, a large representative gathering of the English Church. You will discuss many practical questions of immediate interest for the efficiency of parochial and diocesan work. It is well that you should do so. But let this larger idea dominate your minds—the great destiny which lies before the English Church, if the English Church is true to herself. It will not distract or impede these practical discussions. It will permeate them and endow them with a higher inspiration.

At this time and in this place such an appeal has a special propriety. Twenty years have elapsed since the Church Congress met together in this building to inaugurate its session with a solemn service. It was the year of the first Lambeth Conference. Your president was surrounded on that occasion by Bishops representing the Anglican communion far and wide, from the British islands, from the colonies and dependencies, from the Mission-field, from the United States. This was the first visible presentation of the catholicity of the English Church. It is eminently fit, then, that we should take up this theme in this same place to-day.

Just seventy years ago a famous French writer, yearning for the unity of the Church, and conceiving the Papacy to be the only possible centre of union, appealed to Anglican Churchmen to take the initiative. Himself holding Ultramontane views, and speaking in no measured terms of the position and character of the English Church, he yet recognised in her a prerogative character which might make her a leader in the great movement of the future. Many things have happened in these seventy years.

On the one hand, the Roman Church has taken a step which, unless it be revoked, will render union under her banner an impossibility. The doctrine of Papal Infallibility will appear to English Churchmen a denial of history and a stultification of reason. Whatever visions of unions on these terms may have been entertained by any Anglican in the past, they have been dissipated by this one act.

On the other hand, the Anglican communion has grown with a growth which has far outstripped human prescience. Her intensive and extensive energies alike have been manifested on a scale which has few parallels in the history of Christendom since the Apostolic age. In the treatise *On the Pope*, to which I referred just now, much scorn is poured upon the English Church; and statements are hazarded, which even then only an imperfect knowledge could palliate, and which have been strangely falsified by subsequent history. Two main charges which the author brings against her are her sterility and her isolation.

Her sterility? I am not careful to answer this. The history of the past fifty years shall answer it. The evidence of eyes and ears shall answer it. The testimony of those who are not members of our own communion, even of those who in some instances have been her overt enemies, shall answer it.

But if this charge fails, what shall we say of her isolation? Is not this isolation, so far as it is true, much more her misfortune than her fault? Is she to be blamed because she retained a form of Church government which has been handed down in unbroken continuity from the Apostolic times, and thus a line was drawn between her and the reformed Churches of other countries? Is it a reproach to her that she asserted her liberty to cast off the accretions which had gathered about the Apostolic doctrine and practice, and for this act was repudiated by the Roman Church? But this very position—call it isolation, if you will—which was her reproach for the past, is her hope for the future. She was isolated because she could not consort with either extreme. She was isolated because she stood midway between the two. This central position is her vantage ground, which fits her to be a mediator, when and wheresoever an occasion of mediation may arise.

But this charge of isolation, if it had any appearance of truth seventy years ago, has lost its force now. The English Church is no longer insular, as the English race is no longer insular. The English Sovereign reigns over one-fifth of the whole human race. Of what Monarch or what Power since the world began can the same be said? The great American Republic too—the most rapid development on a grand scale in the history of the world—is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. Nor is it only within the limits of English and American dominions that the influence of the English race is felt. British vessels alone absorb more than three-fourths of the carrying traffic of the world, and America claims a large share of the remainder. Every continent, almost every sea and island, swarms with English and American tourists and travellers. Everywhere, for business or for pleasure, English speaking-people are found.

Corresponding to this progress of the English race is the spread of the English Church. Next year, if it please God, will witness another meeting of the Lambeth Conference. The number of the Anglican Episcopate from which its members are drawn is fast mounting up to 200. This year is the centenary of the first colonial bishopric. We have seized the occasion to take an audit of the progress during this period. I need not trouble you with the statistics of the increase. It is sufficient to say that during the present reign alone the number of our colonial and missionary sees has been multiplied nine or ten fold, and that the rate of increase has been greater in the later decades of this period than in the earlier. The Anglican communion now comprises within her embrace, churches established, unestablished, and disestablished. She has flourishing branches in every continent of the globe. She acknowledges as her sons converts from the highly-developed and immemorial religions of the East, and converts from the rude idol-worship of Africa and the Pacific Islands. The successor of St. Augustine is coming to be regarded as the Patriarch in substance, if not in name, of the Anglican Churches throughout the world. The proud title, *papa alterius orbis*, has a more real meaning now than when it was conferred many centuries ago.

Nor is this all. With the ancient Churches of the East our relations are becoming every day more intimate. With the greater and more flourishing communities we are exchanging friendly intercourse; while the feebler churches, in Syria, in Assyria, in Egypt are looking to us for instruction and for help. The premature movement of Archbishop Wake in Queen Anne's reign is taking effect under his successors in Queen Victoria's. Archbishop Tait, in his later Charges, gave a prominent place to the duties attaching to his office through these wider relations of the English Church; and they have been largely developed under his successor.

What, then, shall we say. The Catholicity has been restored to the English Church in a surprising way. Catholic, indeed, she was potentially before in her doctrine and polity; but now she is Catholic in fact, Catholic in her interests and sympathies, Catholic in her responsibilities and duties. Yet these world-wide relations are almost wholly the growth of the present reign, the growth of our own life-time. What may we not hope in the future, if we respond to God's call?

If we respond. The appeal lies not to the clergy alone, though to them chiefly; but to every loyal son of our Church. Here is my reason for selecting this theme at such a gathering as the present. Let this vision of a glorious future be to every devout Anglican Churchman to-day an inspiration, as a similar vision was to every devout Israelite of old.

What, then, shall be our attitude towards this great work which lies before us? How shall we consecrate ourselves for the task?

We shall not certainly relax our efforts for the evangelisation of the masses at home. We shall feel that any weakness at the heart must impede the circulation and endanger the whole mechanism of the body. We shall not forget that we have special duties towards other Christian communities living side by side with us. We shall cultivate friendly relations where no principle is sacrificed. We shall avoid irritating language, for we shall remember with shame how largely their defection has been due to our fault. We shall be prompt to amend defects in our organisation and to establish effective tribunals of discipline. We shall approach the settlement of these questions in the spirit of concession, knowing that this spirit of concession—this *ἐπιείκεια*—is Christ's own attribute. Above all we shall beware of exalting methods into principles. We shall redouble our efforts to evangelise the heathen world. We shall recognise the duty of the Church as a Church to take a direct part in missionary work, while yet we shall respect the voluntary agencies which have borne the burden and heat of the day. We shall not lay the yoke of a rigid uniformity on the necks of our converts. We shall lay down for ourselves as an aim not the multiplication of English churches on a foreign soil, but the creation of native churches. We shall allow great latitude of development in non-essentials, such as the form of worship. We shall not impose our Articles or even our Prayer-book, as a necessity, on native peoples. We shall act throughout in the faith that they too, like the races converted to Christ in the ages past, have some treasure of their own, some special gift or endowment, to contribute to the House of God. We shall draw closer our intercourse with the enfeebled Churches of the East, not too carefully scanning their faults, whether in doctrine or in practice, but striving by education and by sympathy to raise them to a higher level. Thus will the Catholicity of our Church be at length realised—a true inspiration to ourselves and an untold blessing to mankind: "All ye inhabitants of the world, and ye dwellers on the earth, see ye, when He lifteth up an ensign on the mountains."

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
From Mr. CHARLES WHEELER, Barford, Warwick.
"I have felt so greatly benefited by wearing your **ELECTROPATHIC BELT**, that it affords me pleasure to be able to testify to its **curative power.** The swelling and pain in my legs have quite left me, and I experience a comfortable and warming sensation throughout my body."
GOUT & SCIATICA CURED
Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of the **Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,** should at once stop physicing, and remit *21s.* for HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials POST FREE. **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1887.

THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD'S ADDRESS.

THE President's Inaugural Address at the Church Congress opened with a warm and kindly reminiscence of Bishop Lonsdale, and was a review of the history and progress of the Church and her work during the twenty years which have passed since the Seventh Church Congress met at Wolverhampton, under the presidency of that much esteemed prelate. The address was sympathetic and kind, and the references to Acts of Parliament and other events affecting the Church since 1867 were frequently and warmly applauded. The Bishop quite carried his hearers with him when he declared that the Education Act of 1870 had not inflicted that injury on the Church's office of teaching her children which some feared and others hoped from it; the Church has many more schools of her own than she had eventeen years ago, and her influence is distinctly perceptible even in the board schools. The Burial Laws Amendment Act again, which was regarded as a blow to her interests, is in very great degree a dead letter, even in Wales, where dissent is strongest, and our churchyards are as much our own and as orderly as before. The former Wolverhampton Congress assembled immediately after the first Lambeth "Pan-Anglican" Synod and the present one is to be followed by the third gathering of Bishops, which is to take place next year. These events suggested to the president pertinent and hopeful reflections upon reunion amongst Christians and the practical preparations for it. His real hopes for reunion were grounded chiefly and wisely on "increased spiritual attraction," but his remarks on the revision of the Holy Scriptures and the curious researches and discoveries in archæology and history, and the wiser tolerance of opinions as helping and preparing the way for it appeared to us useful and worth transcribing into our pages, as follows:—

I turn now to another undertaking, begun, continued, and ended within these twenty years—the revision of our English version of the Holy Scriptures. Whatever opinions may be formed as to the success of the work, or the prospect of its ultimate acceptance, it is impossible not to regard it as full of significance. I am bold to say that I believe we are more than ever a Bible-reading and Bible-loving people. Among all classes of society there is springing up a greater interest in the written revelation and a hungering for the comfort of God's Holy Word. It is this which explains the notable fact that at no time in the history of the Church has so much been done for the interpretation of the Scriptures. It is an age of commentaries. The number of such publications in the last twenty years has been quite unprecedented. Within that period the whole of the great commentary known as the Speaker's has been given to the world, besides several others almost as voluminous; some for the libraries of the learned, and others for the cottages of the poor. To these we must add many isolated commentaries by individual writers, of whom one of the most distinguished was our preacher yesterday, and another will speak to us on Friday next. Among the great commentators of the Church in all ages, these two will ever be had in remembrance—the Lightfoot and the Westcott of our own day. It is a remarkable fact that among all the divisions of Christendom, the Bible, and the Bible alone, remains as the universal heritage. I know of no existing Christian community which has abandoned one single portion of the canonical Scriptures. Of the great sacraments of the Church, one has been mutilated by Rome; and both of them neglected by some at least of the Nonconformist bodies. Even the Creeds have not secured universal acceptance. "But the word of the Lord abideth for ever." It has been subjected to attack, to derision, to philosophical contempt. But it stands fast. The discoveries of science have not shaken its testimony, although they may have modified our understanding of some of its statements. The researches of archæology are continually confirming its historical accuracy, and throwing fresh light upon its records. Pharaoh himself, after 3,000 years, comes forth from his tomb, and men can look upon the face of one whose story has been familiar to them from their childish years. How far, and in what way, this remarkable unity in diversity may operate to bind together the dislocated members of the body of Christ, we know not. But He knows, and we leave it with Him.

Twenty years ago we discussed in our Congress the relations of the Bible and science. The discussion has gone on unceasingly, and is likely to continue for a long time to come. But its character and conditions are changing. The time of loud assertion and of angry controversy is passing. Timid minds are still staggered by the discoveries of science, but they are beginning to remember that all truth is of God. The honest doubter is no longer regarded as a criminal, but as an invalid. It is even admitted that there may be a considerable religious element in doubt; and not a few are willing to hope that honest seekers after truth who cannot accept it as it is presented to them here in current forms of belief, may recognise it on the other side in the Person of Him Who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Fifty years hence the grass will grow on the graves of men who are now leading the attack on Christian dogma in the name of what they believe to be more positive truth; but they themselves may have learned before then that what they grasped as truth was only the skirts of the garment of the Living God, the *Deus scientiarum;* that in Him alone all truth for ever dwells; in Whom all speculations of the intellect and all desires of the heart find their fulfilment and their final rest. Even now philosophers and men of science are coming to the conclusion that something more is needed than mere science can supply; that mankind must have a religion whatever the nature of it may be. The need of religion is inherent in our nature. It is not the invention of any man or of any age. It asserts itself in every man's heart, and in every page of the world's history. In this acknowledgment on the part of science there is an incalculable gain. But if we are to profit by it it will need both courage and calmness, and above all an utter integrity of thought and speech. While we hold fast our form of sound words in all its fulness, we must have faith to believe that although truth may present itself under somewhat different aspects to coming generations, its essence will remain unchanged and unimpaired. We may have to learn for ourselves to look upon it with "larger other eyes." For many years past we have been learning by slow degrees that there is nothing—and can be nothing—antagonistic between true science and revealed truth. But there is a further lesson which we have yet to learn—how religion may find in science its handmaid add its friend. Our language to scientific men must be this:—"We know that God is wonderful, but you are showing us how wonderful He is. We listen to you with the deepest interest as you point out to us the process of evolution in Nature and the working of the Reign of Law. We follow you to the furthest point of your discoveries; and then in the presence of your protoplasm, baffled at last by the initial mystery of life, we find you gazing backward into the depths of an empty eternity. We ask you to look up with us into the face of Him from Whom that protoplasm had its being—by Whom these never-failing laws were set in motion to work out the loving purpose of His holy will. We say to the man of science as Moses said to the Arab chieftain in the desert of Sinai—"Come thou with us, and we will do thee good; and thou shalt be to us instead of eyes; and it shall be if thou go with us that what goodness the Lord shall do unto us the same will we do unto thee."

THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

By the Rev. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., Vicar of Warrenpoint, Ireland.

(*Continued from page* 167.)

III.—Opinions of the Brethren—*continued.*

Falling away is impossible, according to Plymouthism, and those who fall away are said never to have been really born again.

What is the value of the certainty when "the believer" cannot tell whether he is indeed converted, or a self-deceiver. St. Paul says, "If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel."—Col. i. 22, 23. Compare John viii. 31; John xv. 4-6; and these words were addressed to believers.

Plymouth views as to the Church are instructive. They are stated by C. H. M. (Mr. Macintosh), in "The Assembly of God." "I refer simply to that assembly which is gathered by God the Holy Ghost, round the Person of God the Son, to worship, and hold fellowship with, God the Father."

. . . .

"It is something to be appealed to in all cases of personal trespass and dispute which cannot be settled by the parties involved. This Assembly may consist of only 'two or three' in any particular place—the smallest plurality, if you please; but there it is, owned by God, *and its decisions ratified in heaven.*"

. . . .

"But let the reader be assured of this, that it is his privilege to possess as divine certainty as to what is a true expression of the Assembly of God as in reference to the truth of his own salvation through the blood of the Lamb; nor should he be satisfied without this."

. . . .

"It will not do to point me to a religious community, with some Christians therein, the gospel preached, and the ordinances administered. I must be convinced, by the authority of the Word and Spirit of God, that it is, in very truth, gathered on the ground and marked by the characteristics of God's Assembly, else I cannot own it. I can own the children of God therein, if they will permit me to do so, outside the bounds of their religious system; but their system I cannot own or sanction in any one way whatever."

. . . .

"Hence the importance of seeing clearly that the materials of which God's assembly is composed are those possessing salvation or eternal life; so that whatever be the object of that assembly, it most certainly is not to provide salvation for its members, seeing that all its members are saved ere they enter its precincts at all. God's assembly is a houseful of salvation from one end to the other. Blessed fact! It is not an institution set on foot for the purpose of providing salvation for sinners, nor yet for providing for their religious wants. It is a saved, living body, formed and gathered by the Holy Ghost, to make known to 'Principalities and powers in the heavenlies, the manifold wisdom of God."

. . . .

"We return with increased power to our point, namely, that the thread of human authority runs through every religious system in Christendom, and that, in good truth, there is not a hair's breadth of consistent standing-ground between the Church of Rome and a true expression of the Assembly of God. We believe that an honest seeker after truth, setting out from amid the dark shadows of Popery, cannot possibly halt until he finds himself in the clear and blessed light of that which is a true expression of the Assembly of God. He may take years to travel over the intervening space. His steps may be slow and measured; but if only he follows the light, in simplicity and godly sincerity, he will find no rest between those two extremes. The ground of the Assembly of God is the true position for all the children of God. Alas! they are not all there; but this is only their loss and their Lord's dishonour. They should be there because not only is God there, but He is allowed to act and *rule* there.

. . . .

"Now, we have been often asked to adduce Scripture in proof of the idea of divine presidency in an assembly. We at once reply, "There am I"; and "God is the Author." On these two pillars, even had we no more, we can triumphantly build the glorious truth of divine presidency—a truth which *must* deliver all, who receive and hold it from God, from every system of man, call it by what name you please."

A sufficiently weak foundation for one of the most arrogant assumptions ever made by any body of professing Christians. Romanism cannot compare in self-complacent egotism with the Brethren. And they, though thus decrying every Christian Church, have not much to offer in place of the systems they seek to overturn. Witness Mr. Macintosh:—

"No doubt we have to mourn over many mistakes, errors, and failures. We have given much occasion to the adversary, by our follies and inconsistencies.

We have been a poor blotted epistle, a faint and feeble witness, a flickering light. For all this, we have to be deeply humbled before our God. Nothing could be more unbecoming in us than pretension or assumption, or the putting forth of high-sounding ecclesiastical titles or claims. The dust is our place. Yes, beloved brethren, the place of confession and self-judgment becomes us, in the presence of our God.

"Still, we are not to let slip the glorious principles of the Assembly of God because we have so shamefully failed in carrying them out; we are not to judge the truth by our exhibition of it, but to judge our exhibition by the truth. It is one thing to occupy divine ground, and another thing to carry ourselves properly thereon."

. . . .

"But we have to remember that errors and failures in the Assembly are no more to be used as arguments against the truth of the Divine Presence there, than are our individual failures and errors to be used against the admitted truth of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the believer."

. . . .

"Things must be in a miserably low state in any assembly when hearts are not thus detected and exposed. It is a fine evidence of the power of the Holy Spirit in an assembly when careless, carnal, worldly, self-exalting, money-loving, unprincipled persons are compelled to judge themselves in God's presence, or, failing this, are driven away by the spirituality of the atmosphere. Such an assembly is no place for these. They can breathe more freely outside."

But how did those people get into the Assembly if none but saints constitute it? If they were saints or believers at any time, why should they be put out of the Assembly for faults of a nature they cannot improve, since it is hopelessly vile? If ever there was a time when the Church would answer to the description "Assembly of God," it was when Christ was present; yet then there was a Judas in the fold. Or the Church of Pentecost; yet then there was an Ananias, a Sapphira, and a Simon Magus; there were disputes about money; there were divisions and "rents." At Corinth was not one of Paul, another of Cephas, another of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 19; xiv. 26; xv. 12). In the Seven Churches were heresies absent? Was there not waning love, lukewarm zeal, false doctrine, corrupt practice? Yet where is the admonition that Christians should separate and organise a new society on the basis of "the Assembly of God"? Was the influence of the Holy Spirit in abeyance for eighteen centuries?

The Church in New Testament language has three significations:—

(1) The whole body of professing Christians ((1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. v. 24, etc).

(2) The Christians of a particular town or country (Acts xx. 17).

(3) A single family or congregation (Rom. xvi. 5).

The "Assembly" does not agree with any one of these even remotely.

The Ministry.

The Brethren do not acknowledge a regular ministry; they do not believe pastors should be paid, but are willing to allow evangelists to receive "donations." Mr. Macintosh says:—

"Christian reader, pause here, and deeply ponder this principle of human authority. We confess we are anxious you should get to the root of it, and judge it thoroughly, in the light of Holy Scripture, and the presence of God. It is, be assured of it, the grand point of distinction between the principles of the Assembly of God and every human system of religion under the sun. If you look at all those systems, from Romanism down to the most refined form of religious association, you will find man's authority recognised and demanded. With that you may minister, without it you must not. On the contrary, in the Assembly of God, Christ's gift *alone* makes a man a minister, apart from all human authority. 'Not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead' (Gal. i. 1). This is the grand principle of ministry in the Assembly of God.

That there were elders and pastors in Apostolic times is so evident, that the Brethren admit it. How do they account for the change? Here it is. Dr. Davis says:—

"Our Lord foresaw the divisions of the Church, and wisely forbore perpetuating an appointment which would be practically null and void through the wilfulness of man."

This reads like profanity, though doubtless meant to be complimentary to the Redeemer. In fact Plymouthism tends to exalt the Second Person of the Trinity above the Father, and by claiming the express sanction of the Holy Spirit for the proceedings in "the Assembly," it further tends to reflect discredit on the Third Person.

IV.—Two Natures.

According to the Plymouth view, there can be "no cleansing of the old nature."

Where then is the work of the Spirit? He does not cleanse the new nature, for that, as they hold, is perfect already. "We have got the new nature that cannot sin; the flesh is there, but the new nature is a sinless nature." What does He cleanse? The Brethren confuse *personality* and *nature*, and render many passages of Holy Scripture meaningless. Thus 2 Cor. iv. 16; 2 Cor. v. 7; Eph. iv. 22-24; 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. vi. 1; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Phil. iii. 14; Rom. vi. 12; 1 Cor. vi. 1920. In truth, Plymouthism is in respect of the "two natures" pure and unadulterated Manicheism. They taught that sin was "*a naturâ non a culpâ*"; that the body is essentially evil. But the Scriptures teach that the body comes from God; that it was essentially good, but has become corrupted by sin, and needs regeneration and sanctification to purify it. The tendency of the Plymouth view is immoral. Croskery, on the authority of Dr. Jessup, tells of a shop assistant who, when charged with robbery, excused himself by saying "he had enough to do in looking after the new nature, and had no time to manage the old Adam, for which he was not responsible." One is reminded of the American storekeeper whose partner was caught in the act of robbing the firm. "How can you, a believer, justify your conduct?" asked the merchant. His partner assured him that he felt no compunction, as it was entirely the "old Adam" that was responsible.

"Ah!" said the Yankee, and seizing a whip, he suddenly fell on the detected hypocrite, and beat him while his arm could hold out. The wretch begged him to spare his life and not murder him. "Never mind," was the caustic reply, "why should you care? I'm not beating YOU, only the '*old Adam*.'"

We have already referred to the opinions of a writer—GEO. C. Here are his views on "*The Old Nature and the New Birth*":—

"So that the believer actually possesses two natures, viz., 'that which is born of the flesh,' and which, because of its very nature, '*cannot please God*'; and 'that which is born of the Spirit,' which from its essential nature *cannot sin*, *because it is born of God*.' In the seventh chapter of Romans you will find these two natures distinctly mentioned side by side. See, for example, the last verse."

. . . .

"Indeed, instead of the presence of a divine life improving the old nature, it only manifests its utter badness. Just as making a poor beggar the present of a new coat by no means improves the appearance of his old, threadbare, dirty waistcoat, but the very opposite."

This has the merit of honesty, but it encourages immorality!!

"Oh! what a comfort it is, that *God is not expecting any good thing from the flesh*; but that He has given it up for ever, as a totally worthless thing. Neither has it any rightful claim upon *us*. We are no longer debtors to the flesh to live after the flesh."

. . . .

"Both these natures will be daily calling our attention to their distinctive cravings. See those two young birds in that hedge-sparrow's nest; both are clamorous for food. The young cuckoo, that was hatched there, cries "Feed me"; and the little hedge-sparrow, in the same nest, cries "Feed me." So with the two natures; only, that while both those nestlings thrive on the same kind of food, the two natures in a Christian cannot, for what feeds the old only starves the new, while that which is food for the new is thoroughly distasteful to the old."

All through "*Personality*" is confounded with "*Nature*."

One of the Brethren once told me that he considered good works held the same relation to true religion that effervescence did to champagne, the champagne being genuine whether it effervesced or not.

PRAYER.

They say that it is useless for an unconverted man to pray to God, because "the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord;" that a believer should not pray for pardon of sin, because he has been forgiven once for all; that a believer should not pray for the Holy Spirit, because he has received Him. Hence prayer is a delusion, for neither the sinner nor the believer has any necessity to use it. In one case it is useless repetition, in the other it is sin. Compare Acts viii. 21-23; Isa. lv. 6, 7; Jonah iii. 4; John iv. 10; 1 Kings xxi. 28, 29; Luke xviii. 1; 2 Chron. xxvi. 5.

If all our sins are forgiven once for all, why did Christ teach the petition, "Forgive us our trespasses"? Compare Heb. iv. 16; James v. 15; 1 John i. 9; 1 John v. 16; Eph. i. 17; John xiii. 10; 1 Thess. v. 23.

The Brethren say that the Lord's Prayer was only given for a certain purpose, intended for those "in a state of twilight." What is the meaning of Matt. xxviii. 20?

Who gave the Brethren authority to set aside the Old Testament on the ground that it applies only to Jews, and the Lord's Prayer as suitable only to a transition period? Their doing so is pure rationalism, and comes under the lash of Rev. xxii. 19. Compare 2 Peter i. 20, 21; 2 Tim. iii. 16; Matt. v. 17; Rom. iii. 31; 1 John iii. 4; 1 Cor. ix. 21.

"It is clear what must be a man's habitual judgment of himself, if when he comes into the presence of a God of infinite purity, no thought suggests itself to him that there is anything in his soul which needs restoration or pardon."—SALMON.

SEPARATION.

"Come out of all system" means "come over and join us."

Did our Lord hold religious intercourse with Judas Iscariot? 2 Cor. vi. 17 is a command to be separate from idolators, not from the Church at Corinth, yet that Church contained both unholy brethren and false teachers. Our Lord commanded the people to obey the teaching of the Scribes and Pharisees, though they were wicked men. There is no message commanding believers to come out of the *Seven Churches*, though they were all tainted with unworthiness. Compare the parables of the Tares and the Draw-net, Vine and Branches, Marriage Feast. The good are *the salt of the earth*, but men do not store up salt, they use it, and it keeps the mass from putrefaction (2 Tim. ii. 19-21; Matt. v. 14). To separate from wicked men is one thing, to separate from professing Christians because they do not pronounce our shibboleth is another. Brethren say that Christendom is in ruins; when then did the "rent state" begin? They say in Apostolic times. But if so, where are the Apostolic injunctions as to separation? They quote this "rent state" as a proof that men should leave other sects and join them, ignoring the fact that they have added yet another "rent," and have even split since their separation into many sects within a sect. And those sects hate each other so cordially that the sceptic may fairly say of them in derision, "See how these Christians love one another!" (1 Cor. i. 2; iii. 3; xi. 21; Gal. iii. 6; ii. 4; Ph. iii. 16-19; 1 Cor. vi. 8; 2 Pet. ii. 1-3; James iv. 1-4.)

Here are Mr. Macintosh's views on separation:—

"A soul led by the Holy Ghost will gather only to the name of Jesus; and if we gather to aught else, be it a point of truth, or some ordinance or another, we are not in that matter led by the Holy Ghost. It is not a question of life or salvation. Thousands are saved by Christ that do not own Him as their Centre. They are gathered to some form of church government, some favourite doctrine, some special ordinance, some gifted man. The Holy Ghost will never gather to any one of these. He gathers only to a risen Christ. This is true of the whole church of God upon earth; and each local assembly, wherever convened, should be the expression of the whole."

And again:—

"But let none imagine that we want to place the evangelist and the Assembly in opposition. Nothing is further from our thoughts. The evangelist should go forth from the bosom of the Assembly, in full fellowship therewith; he should work not only to gather souls to Christ, but also bring them to an Assembly, where divinely-gifted pastors might watch over them, and divinely-gifted teachers instruct them. We do not want to clip the evangelist's wings, but only to guide his movements."

THE ASSEMBLY OF GOD.

The following is the plan by which any argument from the Jewish Church hostile to the Brethren is anticipated:—

"In Matthew xvi. we have the very earliest allusion to the church, and there our Lord speaks of it as a future thing. He says, ‘On this Rock I *will* build my church.’ He does not say, ‘I *have* been, or I *am* building.’ In short, the church had no existence until our Lord Christ was raised from the dead.”

Separation from “the world” is an essential feature of Plymouthism, but as all Christian denominations not connected with “the Assembly” without exception are included according to the Brethren in the world, separation means more than is at first apparent. Here are a few passages from “Jehoshaphat: a Word on World-bordering”:—

“If we join with the world in its schemes, we must expect to be identified with it in its convulsions.”

. . . . . .

“The apostle, by the Holy Ghost, teaches us that unbelievers are ‘unto *every* good work reprobate’ (Titus i. 16). This is enough for an obedient soul. We must not join with those who are so represented. It matters not what they propose—be it a work of benevolence, or a work of religion—Scripture tells us they are reprobate, yes, “reprobate,” though they profess that they know God. This should be sufficient. God cannot accept of, or acknowledge, the works or offerings of those whose hearts are far from Him; nor should the Church mingle with such, even though it be for the accomplishment of desirable ends.”

How bitterly they hate other Christians the following may show:—A clergyman recently mentioned in my presence how horrified he was by a remark made by a Plymouth brother in Dublin some years ago. It was when Dean Daunt was in the zenith of his pulpit fame, and the Plymouthist pointed to the crowds pouring along to his Church, remarking, “Look at all those poor people going to the devil with their prayer-books in their hands.”

Here are the views of C. H. M., “Inside the Veil Outside the Camp”:—

“‘Let us go forth, therefore, unto *him* without the camp, bearing *his* reproach.’ This is not to go forth to men, or to opinions, to a church, or to a creed, but to Christ Himself. We are not of the world. Why? Because Christ is not of the world; the measure of our separation from the world is the measure of Christ’s separation. ‘For here have we no continuing city;’ do our hearts seek one?—some set of circumstances or the like, a something on which to lean? Are we saying, as it were, ‘Oh, do leave me something?’ like Lot pleading for Zoar, ‘Is it not a little one?’ do not take it all away, ‘is it not a little one; and my soul shall live!’”

The following is certainly suggestive on the subject of the pardon of sin:—

“We are never told, in the New Testament, that we are to *ask* for the pardon of sins, there is not such an expression as this. ‘If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.’ Nor is this distinction unimportant. It is a much easier thing for a child to ask for pardon for some fault than to confess it. We may be asking for pardon for any special sin, and we have no Scripture warrant to know that it is put away; but when we confess it, it is a matter of *faith* to know that it is put away. I am speaking now of a believer; were it the question of an unconverted person, the blood of Christ meets that. God is “faithful and just (not gracious and merciful merely) to forgive us our sins,’ etc. The moment I have judged myself about it I am entitled to know that it is gone.”

The following questions from Dr. Croskery’s “Catechism” explain several of the Plymouth heresies:—

“CHRIST’S HEAVENLY HUMANITY.

“Q. *What heresy do the Brethren teach on this subject?*

“A. They say the humanity of Christ was not that of man, fallen or unfallen, but the glorified resurrection-humanity of the redeemed. They say He was man but not the son of Adam; that His humanity was divine, being of the substance of His father, not of His mother. They talk of the “Divine Man,” and of His heavenly humanity, as if the Holy Ghost had introduced Divine elements into His human nature.

“Q. *How do you expose this heresy?*

“A. 1. Christ was as truly man as we are, for He was ‘made of a woman’ (Gal. iv. 4). Remember, it is not said that the Holy Ghost conceived in the womb of the Virgin Mary, but that *she* conceived. If so, the child was of her substance. 2. He was ‘the son of man,’ of the ‘seed of David,’ and of ‘the fathers as concerning the flesh” (Rom. ix. 6). 3. Heb. ii. 16—‘Inasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He Himself likewise took part of the same.’ The Darbyites object that Christ is here said to take the flesh and blood of the children, that is, the sanctified. ‘His relation was with the sanctified.’ But surely the children, though sanctified, are still sinful, because they are still in the body. Christ was ‘made in the likeness of sinful flesh’—and, therefore, in the likeness of Adam fallen, yet was without sin.

“Q. *What texts do the Brethren quote in their behalf?*

“A. 1. Cor. xv. 47—‘The first Adam was of the earth, earthly; the second man was from heaven.’ (Greek.) But this refers to our Lord’s person, not to His humanity. It is not said that the second man, as to His humanity, was from heaven. ‘But if He assumed relation to fallen man, He could not stand before God in personal acceptance.’ This is to say that Christ could not assume relation to fallen man without being Himself a sinner. ‘But He could not be like His brethren in all things, because they are mortal, and He was not mortal.’ Had not Jesus a mortal body—that is, a body capable of dying? Brethren say that He died voluntarily, as He said—‘I lay down my life of myself.’ I ask, had He an immortal body? If so, He could not have died, except by a special miracle. But Heb. ii. 14-16, brings in death, as one of several points of resemblance between Him and His brethren—‘that through death He might destroy Him that had the power of death.’ But, say the Brethren, if He had in His nature a necessity of dying, He could not have died meritoriously. Who created and imposed this necessity? Himself. Christ was, therefore, man as we are.

“THIRD-CLASS SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

“Q. *What new heresy have the Brethren broached on this subject?*

“A. They say Christ suffered at the hands of God, and at the hands of men, and from a certain Jewish remnant, and that His sufferings at the hands of God were alone atoning. They say He was a sin-bearer only during the three last of the six hours of His suffering on the Cross, viz., the hours of darkness.

“Q. *Where did they get this strange doctrine?*

“A. Not from the Apostles, as they admit themselves, but from certain Psalms, especially the 69th

Psalm, which speaks of 'smiting' and 'cutting off' (that is, death), which do not, says Mr. Darby, refer to atonement at all, for others are associated with Him in the 'smiting.'

"Q. *Is there the least ground for such a doctrine?*

"A. 1. We ask, was God punishing his Son unrighteously? This He did, if He smote Him, not as a substitute. If He deserved the 'smiting,' where is His perfectness? If He did not, where is God's righteousness? 2. Christ and the two thieves suffered together. Surely, because they were 'smitten' together, His sufferings did not cease to be vicarious.

"Q. *Do the Brethren not actually teach that Christ's death was unatoning?*

"A. They say it was not His death, but His drinking the cup of wrath, that was really atoning. They separate His sufferings from His death, and assign atonement to His sufferings and deny it to His death, though we are expressly said to be 'reconciled to God by the death of His Son.' Remember. 1. The Cross was the means of His death: 'He made peace through the blood of His Cross.' Yet a Darbyite says—'The Cross in itself would not take away sin.' 2. Christ's bearing the curse of the law for us was death, 'for cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.' (Gal. iii. 13.) Yet a Darbyite says: 'The thieves bore it as He did.' 3. Does not Christ say—'I lay down my life for the sheep.' Surely, this implies an atoning death."—"Catechism on the Doctrines of the Plymouth Brethren," by Rev. T. Croskery. Nisbet: London.

Yet we might learn profitably from our "Plymouth" *brethren* many lessons. They have zeal and earnestness—terrible earnestness. Religion is to them a reality, sin is a reality, eternity is a reality. Would to God they were willing to extend their views, and embrace as a reality the doctrine of the all-embracing Fatherhood of God!! Would to God they could change their Gospel of fear for that which constraineth through divine love!! If they cannot bear with us, let us try to bear and forbear with them. That is an instructive tradition, and may teach us all toleration. Eastern legend has it that one wild and stormy night Abraham turned out an unbeliever who reviled God, and would not allow him to share his tent. "I have borne with him," said God, "for the past hundred years, though he has dishonoured me, and you cannot endure him even for one night."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—Canon Crosthwaite has closed this controversy—so far as he and I are concerned—by making the following admissions: (1) That the highest ecclesiastical Court in the realm—the Court of Arches—pronounced that the "real, spiritual, objective Presence of Christ" ensued upon the act of consecration, and that this "mysterious *Presence in the Holy Eucharist*" (see title page of the Canon's pamphlet) was to be worshipped. On an appeal from this judgment being lodged in a secular Court, *i.e.*, in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, it "hesitated to condemn Mr. Bennett's adoration as idolatrous." Why? How could any Court decide without evidence what a man *meant* to do? We will therefore dismiss as absurd the phrase, he "*might possibly mean*," etc., and come to *facts*. The 4th Article and the Black Rubric only repudiate adoration to "the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any *Corporal Presence* of Christ's *natural* flesh and blood." The Black Rubric only states that our Lord's *natural* body can only be in one place at a time. But on the contrary, that His sacramental body can be in any number of places at once is proved by the miracle of the miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes. The 11th Article does not refer to the subject at all. It says in the office for Holy Communion, "the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour. We eat His Flesh and drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean *by His Body*, and our souls washed through His most precious blood," etc. The Church formularies agree with the teaching of "the Bible, and the Bible alone," as well as with Erigena, Ratramer, and others, who, holding that our Lord was really, spiritually, and truly, but not corporeally, present in the Eucharist represent the opinion of the undivided Church. This dogma is opposed to the comparatively modern one of transsubstantiation, which can be traced to a prevalent philosophical tenet of those times (*now* proved to be unscientific), *i.e.*, that in all bodies there existed a substance distinct from the senses given to us with the bread. Such are the facts on which the evidence was based which dictated the judgment pronounced by the Privy Council that "W. Bennett meant to adore the omnipresent Second Person of the Trinity," and was consequently acquitted of all idolatrous intention when worshipping the "mysterious *Presence* (of the second Person of the Trinity) in the "Holy Eucharist" *after the act of consecrating the elements took place*, which, in "some sense" (see the Canon's pamphlet) meant "that the body of Christ was *given to us with the bread*," &c. (see pamphlet). If "all *mystery* is at an end," why did the Canon employ the word "mysterious" on the title page of his pamphlet? I can "give" a reason for my "*hope*" of salvation, but I cannot give a reason for the belief upon which that hope is based. By "reason," I presume the Canon means an explanation of all Christian mysteries. Rationalists believe nothing which they cannot explain, and the Canon's application of the meaning of the Apostle's words puts him logically in touch with them! The fault found with the *Church Times* and *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* is that they decline at the bidding of maintainers of the virtualist theory to hold it as an article of faith. I never made the statement imputed to me that I believed "our Lord's Body to be only present by effects," &c. I only refrained from anathematising those who did hold that belief. I acknowledge no "oracles" but Scripture interpreted in its natural grammatical sense (see Dean Alford's rule), inculcated in that sense by the undivided Church, and authoritatively decided by an ecclesiastical Court to be the meaning of the formularies of our reformed churches. When the Canon elects to explain the "inward part" of the sacrament by coining the words "effects," it is obviously inconsistent on his part to blame the aforesaid journals for coining the word "species" to explain their idea of the "outward part" of the sacrament.

SOPHIA J. MARSHALL.

THE DUTY OF PARENTS AND OF THE CLERGYMAN.

SIR,—Will you allow me to submit for discussion a question which may interest your readers?

1. Is it the duty of parents to teach their children their catechism and their duty to God and man? Or have they a right to devolve this wholly upon their clergyman?

2. Though it is the duty of the clergy to catechise, does this mean that the duty of teaching first does not belong to parents?

3. In an English parish with 10,000 inhabitants, could it possibly have been meant that there was no duty on parents, but that all was to be cast on the clergyman, thus forcing him to call in others to assist him, or himself to undertake the whole work?

4. From the case of Timothy, and from various texts, as Ephes. vi. 4, Deut. vi. 7, etc., it would seem that in Scripture this duty was performed by the parents.

C. C. V. G.

◆

THE NEW PREFACE TO THE IRISH PRAYER BOOK.

SIR,—Will you allow me to re-state the question between your correspondent and myself? I will pass over "impudence, dishonesty, falsehood, red herring," &c., as coming under the charge of "abusing the plaintiff's attorney."

(1.) The plain facts are these. In the Synod, when the question and answer were debated, it was ruled that, "Given, taken, and eaten" of the Article should not appear in the question to be answered. The objectors were told in vain that Rome would say we were afraid to say in what sense "given, taken, and eaten" are to be understood. But all in vain. These words, though in the Article, were to be eschewed. So much for the animus of the Synod.

(2.) Now for the Revision Committee's report. Its object was to get rid of priest and bread, and make faith the only necessary mean. This is to be read all through the report. In this report, the question and answer were drawn up; so that it is absurd to call my reference to it a "red herring" of a distracting tendency. This report says that the Catechism is not to be resorted to because "less full." This must mean that it does not refer to faith as a mean, as the Article does. No doubt the Article is more full, but this fulness takes in "given, taken, and eaten," which the Catechism omits.

(3.) To take a question from one document, and an answer from another, when done in order to get rid of "given, taken, and eaten," and then to say "One question, with an answer taken out of the 28th Article" only means that the answer is so taken, and not the question, and to found this merely on there being no comma after "answer" is very like special pleading, to call it by no other name. But when we know that the object was to get rid of the Catechism, as "less full," whilst, for its less fulness expressly, it was resorted to for the question, the whole matter assumes an aspect which I will not describe in Mr. Lawrence's vituperative language.

(4) I ask once more why the preface did not say plainly, "Taken from two sources," or "Question from one, and answer from another?" Why was not this said? Why? Because the Catechism was to be ignored as "less full," and the Article ignored, though more full; and all in order to get rid of the "given, taken, and eaten" of the Article, while the Article was held up as the only "full" authority. Mr. Lawrence may spare his wrath. It is impossible to whitewash a blackamore, and so he must leave it.

EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.

P.S.—I herewith send a quotation from the Revision Report, p. 29, which places the blessed *comma* after "answer," so that I am right in saying that it was meant to tell us that both question and answer are taken from the Article. Thus Mr. Lawrence's accusations of me vanish, with all their amplifications. "We have thought it desirable that the following question and answer, taken from the 28th Article, should be added." It is inconceivable that the report meant one thing and the preface another, and that the only proof of such afterthought should be a poor innocent comma! The report is published by Hodges, Figgins & Co., Dublin, 1871.

(In Mr. Lawrence's letter last week there were the following errors:—Page 167, 2nd column, line 18, there should be a comma at *answer;* and the sentence, line 19-20, "These words," etc., should not be in inverted commas. Also, line 11, *means* should be *mean;* also, line 1, *means* should be *mean;* and "therein" should be inserted after "it is."—ED.)

◆

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." October, 1887. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

We have seldom seen a more valuable paper of the kind—and the kind is very useful—than Principal Angus's on "Scriptural Terms used to express Eternity." In his "Letters on Future Punishment," he has already shown that some form of the singular *αἰών*, some form of the plural, and *αἰώνιος* are used to describe the eternity of God, of the worship paid to Him, of the blessedness of the righteous, and of the state of those who die in sin and unbelief. All this he rightly says, in reply to Dr. Farrar's rhetoric, "is simply a question of fact." And in the article before us he examines the Hebrew words, עַד נֶצַח, נֶצַח, (Psalm xvi. 11, xlix. 19); לְנֵצַח נְצָחִים (Isaiah xxxiv. 10); עֲדֵי עַד, עַד, (Isaiah xxvi. 4; Psalm xcii. 7); and עוֹלָם, with their varying combinations. Each one of these, he shows, "is applied to the duration of the praise, &c., offered to God, of the blessedness bestowed on righteousness, and of the punishment of the wicked." Then Principal Angus discusses the LXX. translation of these Hebrew words, and afterwards exposes Dr. Farrar's blunders (for we cannot use any milder word) in "Mercy and Judgment." Dr. Farrar should either buy a Concordance, or if he has one, should count, compare, and examine more carefully; and, still more important, he and others should remember that torrents of eloquence do not alter facts. Of course it is open to the "Universalists" to say that such "facts" only relate to forms of speech, but we are not now concerned with that; we only review Principal Angus's article as an exceedingly industrious piece of work—dictionary and concordance work, of course, but none the less useful for that.

Dr. Moody Stuart attempts another defence of

Jael's act, which some call a treacherous murder, and some righteous zeal; but it is not a good defence, no better than Mozley's well-known, but to our thinking, entirely insufficient one.

Principal Brown continues his "Personal Reminiscences of Edward Irving." They are certainly exceedingly interesting—men like Irving are always interesting—but the article proves conclusively what, indeed, does not require much proof, that Irving was a good inspirer, but not a right leader of men.

Dr. Westcott continues his articles on the R.V.; Dr. Dods writes on Nehemiah. Altogether it is an exceptionally good number of the *Expositor.*

◆

As a result of inquiries held by a Commission appointed some time ago by the Archbishop of Canterbury, a scheme has been adopted for the amalgamation of three of the ecclesiastical parishes of the cathedral city, so as to do away with two of the existing churches. It is understood that his Grace has purposely cleared the ground for the arrangement by removing the present rector of St. Margaret's, Canterbury, to the rectory of Halstead, Kent.

In consequence of the imminent closing of the churchyard, the vicar of Beeston, Nottingham, informed his curate, the Rev. Dr. R. J. Savage, in January last that burials would have to be taken in the cemetery, no portion of which was then consecrated. On Dr. Savage declining to officiate in unconsecrated ground, Mr. Harries wrote on March 14th, sending him, with the approval of the Bishop, six months' notice to quit the curacy.

The election of Dr. Peile to the Mastership of Christ's College, Cambridge, was a foregone conclusion; it was an open secret that the Fellows were anxious to elect him at the previous vacancy, but the new statutes had not come into force, and as a layman he was not eligible. There is no clerical restriction under the present statutes, and there was no obstacle to prevent the governing body from giving effect to the wish which has been formed so long ago. Dr. Peile had a distinguished career as an undergraduate; he held a Craven Scholarship, and was bracketed Senior Classic and Chancellor's Medallist when he took his degree in 1860. As a lecturer he has done signal service to the study of comparative philology in the University, and Christ's College has succeeded in obtaining a remarkable number of high places in the Classical Tripos since he has been tutor.

The election to the Lady Margaret Professorship, at Cambridge, will take place on Wednesday the 26th. Professor Hort has addressed a letter to the electors, and explains that it would be his desire in any future work, "either as a student or as an instructor and helper of younger students, to be mainly occupied with the interpretation and elucidation of the Bible, in constant reference to its theological teaching, and with the history of the Church, for the earlier centuries in particular, giving special attention to the history of doctrine and institutions." Canon Luckock, in a similar letter, states that it would be his endeavour, if he were elected, "to associate the teaching of the chair more especially with pastoral theology, and in private to help as far as possible those undergraduates who from a variety of causes are unable to supplement their University course by special training elsewhere for the ministry of the Church.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barrass, Rev. J. Stephen, Curate of Wendon Lofts with Elmdon; Clerical Organising Secretary of the Church of England Young Men's Society.

Barthropp, Rev. N. Shafto, Rector of Itton and Mounton, Chepstow; English Chaplain at St. Moritz, Engadine, for the winter season.

Blunt, Rev. Henry G. S., M.A., Rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn; Chaplain to the Lord Mayor Elect.

Bradley, Rev. Edward, M.A., Chaplain of the Choristers and Treasurer's Vicar and Sacrist of Lichfield Cathedral, and Chaplain of Milley's Hospital.

Bramley, Rev. Henry Ramsden, M.A., Prebendary of Bedford Major in Lincoln Cathedral.

Bremridge, Rev. H., Curate of Bideford; Vicar of Hinkleigh, North Devon.

Caldecott, Rev. Alfred, late fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and late Principal of Codrington College, Barbadoes; Organising Secretary to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for the Dioceses of Ely and Peterborough.

Clarke, Rev. Benjamin Strettell, D.D., Vicar of Christ Church, Southport, and Honorary Canon of Liverpool Cathedral; Archdeacon of Liverpool.

Edwardes, Rev. David, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Bradley-le-Moors, Staffordshire.

Fisher, Rev. F. H., Priest-Vicar and Precentor of Grahamstown Cathedral; Chaplain of Wolseley Settlement, Cape Colony.

Frere, Rev. William John, M.A., Chaplain of Hockerill Training College, Bishop Stortford.

Hare, Rev. Robert S., Curate-in-Charge of the Chapel-of-Ease at Hosborough, Eckington, Derbyshire.

Luscombe, Rev. R. P., Vice-Principal of the Gloucester, Theological College; Chaplain of St. Bartholomew's, Hospital, Gloucester.

Munro, Rev. R. D., Diocesan Missioner for the Diocese of Bath and Wells.

Perrin, Rev. W. W., Vicar of St. Luke's, Southampton; Vicar of Godalming, Surrey.

Ramsay, Rev. Clifford Dalhousie, Curate in Sole Charge of Chelsham, Surrey; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for West Staffordsire.

Reeder, Rev. William Tofield, M.A., Curate of Whitby; Vicar of St. Thomas's Scarborough.

Reid, Rev. John Edward, M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Coventry; Rector of Ashow, Warwickshire.

Shelton, Rev. N. W., Chaplain to the Infirmary, Gloucester.

Snowden, Rev. Arthur Hillersdon, M.A., Curate of Armley, Leeds; Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels', Northampton.

Taylor, Rev. A. W., Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of St. Peter's, Farnworth.

Thomas, Rev. Stephen, Curate of the Parish Church, Leek; Vicar of Rushton-Spencer, Macclesfield.

Thompson, Rev. George, Vicar of Harley Wood, Yorkshire.

Warren, Rev. Charles, Incumbent of St. John's, Ashbourne, Derbyshire.

◆

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Carrow, Rev. Harry, formerly Rector of Loxton, at Park Place, Weston-super-Mare, on the 30th ult., aged 74.

Housman, Rev. George Vernon, M.A., for nearly twenty-five years Rector of Quebec, at the Rectory, Quebec, on the 26th ult., aged 66.

Hunt, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of St. Michael's, Cornhill, City, formerly for twenty years Master and Chaplain of Bancroft's Hospital, at 30, Douglas Road, N., on the 30th ult., aged 62 years.

Jerram, Rev. S. J., late Vicar of Chobham, at Ealing, on the 27th ult., aged 72.

Tragett, Rev. Thomas Heathcote, at Awbridge Danes, Romsey, on the 1st inst., aged 88.

Wayet, Rev. West, M.A., Hon. Canon of Lincoln, and for fifty-three years Vicar of Pinchbeck, at Pinchbeck Vicarage, near Spalding, on the 28th ult., aged 77.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE PHARISEE AND THE PUBLICAN.

By Rev. CANON LIDDON, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, ON SUNDAY, AUGUST 21ST, 1887.

"The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee that I am not as other men."—LUKE, xviii. 11.

THE picture which our Lord sets before us in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican shows, among other things, how the Temple was used by the people in His days. The people did not only attend its public services; they used it as a place of retirement for private prayer when no public rites of any kind were going forward. The Temple welcomed them when they would escape from homes, narrow and squalid, in which it was difficult to command solitude and quiet. In the courts of the House of the Lord they might be practically alone, even although amid a company of fellow-worshippers, and might pour out before God the sorrows and aspirations of their hearts. Much it is to be wished that the fabrics devoted to the worship of Jesus Christ in this Christian country could be more used for a like purpose than they are, and, in particular that this great temple, whose doors during so many hours of every day are open to all the world, could be more generally turned to good account by Christians, as a welcome refuge from the distracting cares of life—as a sanctuary in which weary or anxious souls might often offer their private tribute of prayer and praise to their Creator and Redeemer.

To the Temple, then, went the Pharisee and the publican. Our Lord is describing what was an every-day occurrence. In the Temple there was room for all. There the highest and lowest stood side by side before the majesty of God; and in the Pharisee and the publican were represented the very poles of religious and social respectability. We are now most concerned with the Pharisee.

The Pharisees, as the name "Perushim" implies, were, before all things, men who insisted on their separation from others. They came into existence as a distinct religious sect under the high priesthood of Jonathan, about a century and a half before the birth of Christ. Their ruling idea, their rallying cry, was the duty of avoiding all intercourse with, all assimilation to the ways of the heathen world. This idea, let us observe, was deeply rooted in the religion of Israel. The prophecy of Balaam was enshrined in the very book of the law: "This people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations." One of the most fatal errors of the Israelites after the conquest of Canaan, was that they were mingled among the heathen, and learnt their works, insomuch that they worshipped their idols, which turned to their own decay; yea, they offered their sons and their daughters unto devils. Mindful of this experience, the constant effort of religious men in later days was to insist that Israel, as the people of revelation, was a peculiar, or separated people, which, religiously speaking, could only be safe so long as it held aloof from the powerful and fascinating societies of heathen men around it. Insistence on this principle entered largely into the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah, and it required altogether a new vigour during the struggle against the Syrian king, Antiochus Epiphanes. Antiochus was bent upon breaking down all the barriers which separated the Jews from his other subjects. He tried to proscribe Jewish ordinances, and to make the Jews, whether they would or not, live just like pagan Greeks. In the second Book of the Maccabees the reign of Antiochus is accordingly called the "times of the mingling," or intermixture; and all religious men in the country were banded together to resist this attempt of the heathen king, even to death.

The most energetic of these men were called "Chasidim," the pious; but their fervour soon became narrow, selfish, bitter. It added to the troubles of the great leader, Judas Maccabæus, and the name, thus discredited, soon passed out of hearing. Not quite two centuries after they reappeared as the separated ones, as the Pharisees; and as such they soon embraced within their ranks all the earnestly religious people in the land. They did this so largely that they could scarcely at one time be called a sect. Before the birth of our Lord they had achieved a position of great influence, not unlike that of the Evangelicals in England some fifty or sixty years ago, and they owed their influence to the fact that they were largely men of earnestness and sincerity, who were upholding a principle which was undoubtedly of great importance to the old religion of Israel.

It is important to notice the motive of the observances and manner of life which were associated with the Pharisees. They eagerly multiplied all outward signs which could distinguish them from the heathen, or from those of their own countrymen who seemed to have a fancy for heathen ways. Taken by themselves, and apart from the motive which dictated them, many religious observances among Christians would be difficult to explain satisfactorily; and it is due to the Pharisees to remember why they began, a century and a half before the birth of our Lord to act as they did in religious matters. Their religious life was throughout a protest—a protest against a prevalent tendency to obliterate the lines which marked off the religion of Israel from sheer heathenism. This was the meaning of the tassels in their dress; this was the object of the scrolls and the small leathern boxes fastened on their foreheads, their heads, and their necks, and inscribed with texts of the law. It was to accentuate this difference that they braved popular scorn or anger by offering long prayers as they stood in the public streets and squares. Their strict fast reminded them of duties, of truths, of events with which the heathens had nothing to do. Their constant washings recalled to them the ideal of moral purity at which a good Jew should aim, and of which heathenism knew nothing. Their distinctive observances were, indeed, most of them, very modern; they were unknown before the Babylonish captivity, and the fiction which had been current in Judæa in our Lord's day that they had been handed down traditionally from Moses to the great synagogue, and from the great synagogue to themselves, could only have grown up in an uncritical age, when religious men were too intent on a practical object immediately before them to enter upon a severe examination of a question of theological or historical truth. But we must not do the Pharisees injustice. In most respects they contrast favourably with their latitudinarian rivals, the Sadducees, to whom the majority of the higher members of the priesthood belonged. They were more earnest; they were more anxious for the glory of God, as they understood it; they were more anxious for the good of men, as they understood it; they were more religious; they were more humane. There can be no doubt that some of the best men in the Jewish nation—Gamaliel, for example—were Pharisees, and they could never have attained the great moral position which they undoubtedly held in our Lord's day unless they had, or had had, some substantial virtues which were generally recognised.

And this better side of the Pharisees is thrown into sharp relief by the other representative man whom our Lord describes as going up into the Temple to pray. No class of men was so looked down upon by Jewish opinion with such stern and universal condemnation as were the publicans. The publicans of the New Testament, as you know, were the collectors of the revenue which was paid by the population of Palestine to their Roman masters. Long before the conquest of Judæa the Roman senate had adopted the bad plan of farming both the direct taxes and the customs to individual capitalists or to companies who undertook to pay a given sum into the public treasury, while making as large a margin of profit as they could to themselves. These capitalists, living in Rome, employed on their own account collectors in the different provinces of the empire, and each collector had a number of sub-collectors under him, who were generally taken from the population of the province. These sub-collectors were the publicans of the New Testament. Zaccheus may have been a collector of the higher order. St. Matthew, before his conversion, was a sub-collector, engaged in the custom-house at Capernaum. The sub-collector made what he could out of the revenue before he transmitted it to the collector. The collector took from it what he dared before he forwarded it to the agency in Rome which undertook the farming of the taxes. The consequence, of course, was that these sub-collectors generally spent their lives in extracting as much money as they could from the people by whatever means they could. They seem to have had a large discretion in assessing the value of goods which had to pay duty, and to have used their discretion unscrupulously. St. John the Baptist's advice to them "Exact no more than that which is appointed you," is very suggestive as to their usual practice; and when Zaccheus professed before our Lord that, if he had taken anything from any man by false accusation he restored to him fourfold, he glanced at the common practice of his profession to bring false charges of attempts to cheat the revenue in order to extort hush-money. Thus, in other provinces of the empire, the lower order of publicans were generally spoken of as the wolves and bears of society, and there was a well-known current proverb to the effect that every tax-collector was a thief. But in Judæa there was a feeling about the publicans of a peculiarly bitter kind, and to which nothing corresponded elsewhere. The Jewish scribes generally held that it was not lawful to pay any money to a heathen government, and thus the publicans who exacted such tribute were, if they were Jews by birth, regarded as not merely oppressors of the people, but as apostates from the religion of Israel. They were classed in the common talk of men with sinners and harlots; and to eat and drink with them was considered to be out of the question, not merely for a rabbi, who expected to be looked up to, but for all decent people.

Our Lord, as we know, in His boundless compassion for the erring and the unfortunate, set Himself to correct and defy common Jewish feeling about the publicans as about the Samaritans. He was, in consequence, scornfully described as the friend of publicans and sinners. He did not scruple to meet publicans at entertainments. When he visited Jericho there were very many priests living there, and yet He chose to invite Himself to the house of the publican Zaccheus. Nay, He chose one member of this despised class to be even an apostle and evangelist. All this was part of His plan of showing that He came to save men of all sorts and conditions, and that none lay outside the scope and range of His redemptive love. But His merciful conduct, so far from contravening, is an illustration of the fact that, as a body, the publicans were men of bad character.

They lived on the frontier of the criminal classes, if they did not actually belong to them, and they were none the better for the varnish of official respectability which some of them wore before the world.

The Pharisee, then, as eminently representing the religious world of Judæa, seems to have everything in his favour as he goes up into the Temple to pray. And, if the prayer of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord, the average publican, it must be owned, seems to have scant title to be heard at all. This, we may be sure, was the feeling of those who heard our Lord begin with the statement that two men went up into the Temple to pray, the one a Pharisee, and the other a publican.

What, then, is the ground of our Lord's decision in favour of the publican? How comes it to be that, in His unerring judgment, the publican went down to his house justified and accepted rather than the Pharisee? Clearly there must be some most serious flaw in the case of the Pharisee which can so entirely disturb what at first appears to be the balance in his favour. What is it in the man, what is it in his prayer that our Lord condemns?

Was it his expression of thankfulness? Surely thanksgiving can never be out of place for those who believe in a Being who is the fountain of all goodness. Thanksgiving is a duty for all times and seasons. It is the occupation of the angels in heaven. It should be the delight of all good men on earth. It might be better for us Christians if we said, more often than we do, after the Pharisee, "God, I thank thee." Christendom is often more like the nine lepers who never turned back to give glory to God, than the one who did. Is it not the apostle of Divine grace himself who bids us "in everything give thanks, for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you"? Have we not just been led to thank God "for all the blessings of this life, but, above all, for His inestimable love in the redemption of the world through our Lord Jesus Christ, for the means of grace, and for the hope of glory"? And, if it be a great happiness to know the truth, to know the will of God, or to be free, at least, from great offences, is it not well to thank God for this? No, our Lord does not condemn the Pharisee for thanking God. He is much more likely to condemn you and me for forgetting to do so.

Nor, surely, is the Pharisee the worse for not being an extortioner, or unjust, or an adulterer, or guilty of the practices which were common with the publicans. It is not necessary to be indifferent to the elementary morality in order to escape what is bad in Pharisaism; and a religion which should make men careless about elementary morality, would not be a true or a trustworthy religion. "Lord, who shall dwell in Thy Tabernacle, or shall rest upon Thy holy hill! Even he that leadeth an uncorrupt life, and doeth the thing that is right, and speaketh the truth from his heart. He that useth no deceit with his tongue, and hath done no evil to his neighbour, and hath not slandered his neighbour." The great preacher of the grace of God tells us as plainly as any writer in the Bible that there are sins which exclude from the kingdom of heaven. Our Lord, we may be quite sure, does not condemn the Pharisee because the Pharisee is alive to the difference between justice and injustice, between purity and impurity, between right and wrong.

Did our Lord, then, condemn him for fasting twice in the week? Fasting was a duty for good Jews. It was even enjoined by prophets who warned men against trusting too much to ceremonial observances. If the Pharisee fasted more than the rule of his religion required, this, taken by itself, might have been a proof of his earnestness. Fasting, you remember, is as much a Christian duty as a Jewish. It is as much a Christian duty as prayer. It is not, I admit, a popular duty; but our Lord himself enjoins it on us in the Sermon on the Mount, and He adds directions which will save it from being ostentatious or vain-glorious and, so, sinful. He could not, then, have condemned the Pharisee simply because he fasted twice in the week. Was it, then, that the Pharisee was so wrong in giving tithes of all his produce? In doing this he was obeying the spirit as well as the letter of the law, which, let us observe, was commonly evaded by the many Jews who only gave to the service of God a tenth of certain specified products, while omitting the rest. Here, too, surely we Christians should do better if we imitated the Pharisee, if we freely devoted at the least a tenth of our yearly income to the service of God, instead of giving the little we do give by fits and starts upon no fixed religious principle whatever.

What, then, was the weak point? What was the fatal flaw in the Pharisee's case which ruined so much in him that in itself was excellent—which availed to place him, in the judgment of our Lord, at a lower level than that of the publican?

It was this: the Pharisee's religion, as it appeared in his prayer, was a religion centring not upon Almighty God, but upon himself. It was, therefore, properly speaking, not a religion at all. In our days, no doubt, people use the word "religion" in a great many debased senses. They speak of a religion of art, of a religion of humanity, of a religion of politics—of your making a religion of anything which you have a taste for. But, properly speaking, religion means a certain relation of dependence and obligation between the soul and God; and when God is left out of the question religion cannot really exist. In true religion the soul looks out of and beyond itself to that Great Being who is at once, in His awfulness and His beauty, the stay and the end of its existence. But the Pharisee, even in prayer, is entirely taken up with himself.

Look at him as he walks into the middle Court of the Temple, as he places himself (so the original word seems to imply) in a chosen position or attitude. He names God. He thanks God. He cannot, of course, drop the conventional language of devotion; but he stands there and prays with himself or, rather, with the eye of his soul directed towards himself. He is thinking, not of God, but of himself. He begins with an expression of thankfulness, but as we examine it what an equivocal sort of thankfulness it is! Thankfulness, to be accepted, must go hand in hand with other things. It must be based on a sincere recognition of our unworthiness of the blessings for which we thank God. Its heartfelt language must be: "Lord, I am not worthy of the least of all Thy mercies." True thankfulness is accompanied by misgivings on the score of the poor use that has been made of God's blessing in the past, and of the account which must one day be rendered for them. And especially does the thankful man ascribe the blessings of life to the Author of all goodness. From nothing does he shrink more unaffectedly than from seeming to claim any credit for himself. But the Pharisee's thankfulness is less an offering made by his soul to God than a conventional way of expressing his profound satisfaction with himself. He begins, "God, I thank Thee." Had he been thinking of God he would have said, "I thank Thee for the grace and help which Thou hast given me, and to which alone I owe it that I have escaped the sins of other men." But this was, "God, I thank Thee that I am not as other men are." Another Pharisee—one who became in his time a Christian apostle—only mentions his place and work to add, "By the grace of God I am what I am. I laboured more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me." The Pharisee of the parable says nothing of what he owes to grace, as he says nothing of what he needs on account of sin.

Consider, again, the man's comparison of himself with others. "I thank Thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican." Surely no good is done by remembering the faults of others, unless it be part of our duty to correct them, or when we are praying to God to help them. To remember them only with the result of reflecting with satisfaction on our superiority to them is, indeed, folly and presumption. General declamations about the wickedness of others are often unjust. Other people are not so bad as our suspicions or rhetoric would make them, and pride soon grows apace when, under cover of deploring the sins of others, we are thinking with satisfaction of ourselves. After all, it is not much to have avoided vices to which, perhaps, we have never been strongly tempted or tempted at all. It is more useful to compare ourselves with true servants of God, with those who, having had fewer advantages than we to start with, have done much more than we for His glory and for their fellow-men. If the Pharisee had remembered that God's judgment of men takes account of their opportunities, he would have felt that he might very possibly be comparing himself with persons who were his superiors. The publican had enjoyed none of his advantages. The publican had been exposed to temptations from which he had been free. It was something that the poor publican had come at all to pray in the house of God. Surely this might have inspired interest and hope in a zealous Pharisee, and it was possible that this publican might be, in God's sight, a St. Matthew on the eve of conversion to a higher truth than he, the Pharisee, had ever dreamt of.

And then the Pharisee so carefully enumerates his good deeds. Like a zealous Jew, he fasted twice in a week. He paid tithes of all that he possessed. These are good things to do; but why should he say anything about them, especially before God? The bloom of a good work is forfeited as soon as we take credit to ourselves for it. Vanity of this kind is fatal to the real excellence which God approves and accepts. There may be occasions when a good man is forced to refer to what he has done—occasions when God's glory or his own usefulness are at stake, and for objects such as these David and Job and St. Paul do so. But the safe rule is to say nothing about our good deeds. No good work is really our own. It is God's work in us, and the best of works may easily be vitiated by some sin which is our own. Some bad motive, some selfish purpose, may make what seems so fair to the eye of man worse than worthless before God.

And especially observable is it that the Pharisee asks God for nothing—neither for pardon, nor for mercy, nor for grace. He seems to feel the need of nothing—neither of perseverance in his good deeds, nor of power to multiply them, nor of freedom from the sins which would make them valueless he is perfectly satisfied with himself—satisfied with what he is, satisfied with what he is not, satisfied with his superiority to other men, satisfied with what he does, satisfied with what he gives. Why should he pray? Prayer is the language of the needy, of the dependent, of the anxious. It means misgiving, deep misgiving, on the score of all that side of life as to which he, the Pharisee, has no misgiving whatever. This is the crowning characteristic of his bearing in the presence of God. This is the vice which makes all that he does, all that he is, so utterly unacceptable to God—his unalloyed satisfaction with himself.

Compare him with the publican. The publican does not venture beyond the Court of the Gentiles, though he may be a Jew by birth. He creeps just inside the door and stands there afar off.

Indeed, very far off is he from the Pharisee. He has nothing to say to his own credit. If he is unlike other men, it is that he believes himself to be worse than other men. He is, or has been in his time, an extortioner, unjust, perhaps an adulterer. He has never fasted in his life. He has never given tithes or anything else to the service of God. He feels himself to be outside religion and everything connected with religion. He feels that he has no right to be there treading the sacred pavement even of the outer Court of the Gentiles. He defiles it, he thinks, by his very presence. He has no claim, no title, to consideration or acceptance which he can urge upon the Awful Being within the precincts of whose sanctuary he has dared to venture. He is so far from being able to look around him for anything that may reassure him that he cannot even raise his eyes to heaven. He can only smite upon his breast, and condense into three words the greatest of the psalms of penitence: "God, be merciful to me a sinner."

And yet the publican's prayer has in it that indispensable quality which the Pharisee lacks. The publican sees God as Job saw Him when he abhorred himself, as Peter saw Him when he cried: "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord!" And, seeing God, he offers his prayer, not to self, but to God. The superstructure of the Pharisee's religion—his freedom from gross vice, his fasts, his tithes—wants the foundation which the publican's has. The publican's religion has as yet no superstructure. That will come in time, but he is taking the first essential step, the self-renouncing, self-emptying cry for help addressed to the one Being who can give it.

The Pharisee, notwithstanding the outward purity of his life and his self-sacrificing activity, is, in consequence of his tranquil satisfaction with himself, much farther from God than is the publican. Both men equally need that redemption which in a few months will be offered on Mount Calvary, but the publican's heart is already open to embrace it; the Pharisee's heart is closed.

The Pharisees, as we know them in the Gospels, have long disappeared from the scene of history. But Pharisaism, as a spirit, survives. It wears Christian clothes; it uses Christian language. It is, at heart, still in the Court of the Temple, with its eye not upon God revealed in His Blessed Son, but upon self. No Christians may safely deem themselves free from the pervading infection of the Pharisee spirit. We may sink into it if we think with satisfaction upon our attendance at church services, on our reception of the Holy Sacrament, on kind acts done to the poor, on work in Sunday schools, or for benevolent societies, or for Christian missions, or for anything else that brings us credit with our fellow-Christians. We do not escape it if we pride ourselves on our rejection and distrust of all outward forms, on our indifference to the means of grace, on what we may deem to be the especial spirituality of our religion, on our rejection of what is traditional in usage or belief. The essence of Pharisaism is not satisfaction in this or that particular feature of our religious state or practice, but in any part of it whatever. We may be just as thorough Pharisees in dwelling on the pure spirituality of our worship, when contrasted with the fancied formalists or externalists around us, as in dwelling on our care for reverence or order in contrast to the irreverence of others, or on our practical benevolence in contrast to their apparent insensibility to the claims of the suffering and the poor. The subtle, destructive taint may insinuate itself everywhere. It may lurk beneath the robes of some great prelate, as he pontificates in his cathedral, but also in the Quaker meeting, from which all forms are consistently excluded. It may be the bane of a layman's religion, no less than of a clergyman's. It may flourish north of the Tweed as well as south of it—on this side of St. George's Channel as well as on the other. It may infect churches too sure, whether of their Catholic lineage or of their Scriptural purity, to suspect the extent of their real shortcomings. It may waylay and ruin individual souls who are even eagerly abjuring it, and in the very process of doing so. None of us can deem himself safe against its approaches, and, surely, no precautions will be thought unnecessary which may help to keep it at bay.

Let me, then, offer one practical suggestion. When you find yourselves beginning to take a Pharisaic pleasure in contemplating this or that part of your religious life—your prayers, your emotions, your good works, your experiences, your influence on others, your familiarity with religious ideas and literature, your command of religious language, or anything else of the sort—try, oh, try to remember any one passage in your past lives of which even now you can scarcely think without keen distress, even anguish, and which you would not have known to those who respect and love you, for all that you possess! Some such passage there is in most lives, and you may turn the bitter and humbling memory to good account if you summon it up from oblivion to scare away from your souls the hideous spectre of Pharisaism. One there is who searches the very hearts and reins, who knows it all, and while you remember that His eye is upon you in its awful omniscience, in its winning tenderness, you will not have the heart to be a Pharisee.

Of this let us be sure—that our Lord's sentence on the prayer of the Pharisee in the parable holds good for all time. We shall not, we cannot, be accepted if we come into the sacred Presence well satisfied with ourselves, thinking meanly of others. It is for ever true, as Mary sings with us each evening of the year in her Magnificat—it is ever true that God "hath filled the hungry with good things, but the rich He hath sent empty away."

Without a deep dissatisfaction with self, neither true prayer, nor true praise, nor true thanksgiving is possible for sinners such as we, because these things are only possible when we are consciously uniting ourselves with Christ our Lord, and leaning on His prevailing merits and intercession; and our deep and constant need of Him can never be understood while the Pharisee temper has a hold on us. "Because thou sayest, I am rich and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing, and knowest not that thou art wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked, I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire that thou mayest be rich, and white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear, and to anoint thy eyes with eyesalve that thou mayest see."

It is that we may dissociate ourselves from the Pharisee, that we may place ourselves side by side in spirit with the publican, that, at the beginning of each morning and evening service the Church leads us to confess that we have erred and strayed from God's ways like lost sheep, that we have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts, that we have offended against His holy laws, that we have done those things which we ought not to have done, that we have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and even that there is no health in us. Our ability to use this language quite sincerely is a fair test of the vital question whether we have any such true knowledge of self as comes from a true sight of the All-holy God, whether we are satisfied or out of heart with self, whether we have more in common with the Pharisee or with the publican.

May our Lord, of His infinite mercy, inflict on us any pain or humiliation we may need in order to attain to that true self-distrust which welcomes His pardoning love, and when we are sure of our utter need, of our indebtedness to Him—then may He create in us a clean heart and renew a right spirit within us, and give the comfort of His help again, and stablish us with His princely Spirit!

◆

THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL.

By Rev. J. LIGHTFOOT, M.A., D.Sc., Vicar of Cross Stone, Todmorden.

Sermon Preached in the Foundling Chapel, Sunday, August 14th.

"Whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate."—Romans viii. 29.

THE words which I have read out to you as our text introduce us to a very ancient controversy. Not a little of the best thought of the world has been engaged in speculating upon the relation existing between the created universe and the Divine Creator. The reason for which men in all ages, with very rare exceptions, have acknowledged the existence of God I do not purpose to discuss with you now, beyond one or two quite general remarks. Men's lives and powers are finite and restricted. In seeking their origin we find it necessary to suppose other finite causes adequate to produce the effects which we see. In pursuing this train of thought we have ultimately to assume an infinite regression of finite causes, or a single self-sufficient first cause. Whichever theory is adopted, it is of first importance to observe that it, equally with the other, contains an unproveable assumption. That "no man by searching can find out God," is a familiar article in Christian belief, but that the scientific materialism which is so popular to-day, that this, too, is built upon a "faith," is not so readily acknowledged. But in speaking of the eternity of matter, or the infinity of the regression of finite causes, the "eternity," or the "infinity," is an assumption of which no proof can be offered.

But although, by logical processes, man may not find out God, yet, if what I said to you on conscience and the first principles of morality last Sunday be true, then it would appear that man is not confined to the logical understanding as his one source of knowledge. There is, as Kant taught us, a higher faculty than the understanding, which we call "reason," or conscience, and in this we find provision for the recognition of higher truth. Just as the fundamental truths of morality, and the fundamental assumptions of science require no other witness than themselves, nor, indeed, are able to offer any; so too the reality of the Divine existence is a "truth so plain that it needs no proof," it is a truth so essentially fundamental to our intellectual life that it admits of no proof. And hence it is that you will notice whenever arguments on the subject are presented to you, then, and not till then, do doubts arise, and even then the doubt always attaches itself to the adequacy of the argument, and not to the fact itself. The belief in the Divine existence is given to us. Men may argue themselves out of it, but they cannot argue themselves into it. It is, as all other fundamental truths are, a revelation to the soul of the individual. But when once the fact is recognised, its confirmation is established by the experience of our conscious lives. The order and beauty of the universe, the facts of moral obligation and sense of responsibility, the religious instinct in man, all these now find their adequate explanation, whilst at the same time they confirm our belief. But with the acknowledgment of an Absolute Being the mind passes on at once to ask what is the relation in which we, as dependent, stand toward Him. If in its origin man and all finite existence is dependent upon the Almighty, then it would seem that upon His will we are dependent for our continuance. In this case at once you will see that of the future we can say nothing. All that is best within us points toward continued existence. As day by day we increase in age, we see how these bodies of ours develop until maturity and then decay. On the other hand, we find no such similar decay in the mental life. The full significance of moral responsibility, too, can only be realised in a future state of existence. But though futurity of existence seems thus involved in the facts of this present life, yet since it depends upon the Divine will, it can only be known to us as a matter of distinct revelation. Immortality, if it be ours, must be the gift of God.

But although our thoughts run oftentimes to the past as we speculate as to the origin of all things, and oftentimes to the future as we muse upon the destiny of things, yet our most earnest thought is given, and rightly given, to our duty in the present. Whence came I? That is important. Whither am I going? That, too, is important. What can I do? or rather, what is the significance of what I do? This is all important. And being all important, it will hardly be a matter of surprise to know that men have differed most widely in their answers to this question. From whatever position you advance to consider this question, you are at once confronted with the Shibboleths of opposing factions. Fatalists, Calvinists, Stoics, Predestinationists, Necessitarians, and the like on the one hand; Libertarians, Armenianists, Pelagianists, and the like as champions of the freedom of the will on the other. According to the teaching of the one party, man is little better than a complicated machine. The same laws which hold good in the physical world also hold good in the inner world of man. A man must be what he will be. He is in very truth the creature of circumstance. In short, if you could know all the circumstances in the case of any man—circumstances of his inner and outer life—then you could predict how he would act, in any given case, with the same certainty as you can predict the path of a planet, or the behaviour of given elements in the chemist's laboratory. The supporters of this theory appeal to Scripture and to Nature in confirmation of their position. The argument from Scripture in favour of election, as it is commonly called, I do not propose to discuss. When you remember that not only the believers in this theory, but also those who most violently condemn it, that these, too, appeal to the sacred Scriptures for confirmation of their position, you cannot help feeling that somewhat further seems to be needed. God has given to man more Bibles than one. And these various Bibles must agree, the message of the one cannot in spirit be contradictory to that of the other. You know that since men have recognised that the open page of Nature was a book of God, they have been admitted into a fuller knowledge of the wisdom and power of the Almighty. We have learnt, and wisely learnt, to read our Bible with all the light that scientific investigation could throw upon it. We have long since put aside the childish notion that the Holy Scriptures were a volume teaching physical science, and anticipating its results. Now what I would impress upon you is this, that we ought to think in like manner about the problems which mental science brings before us. If we are content to say that the writers of the various books of the Bible speak of the details of physical science according to the knowledge of their day, and that they were not supernaturally aided in that respect, then I would urge that with reference to the problems of mental science the case is not otherwise. If this be acknowledged I think the "point" is at once and altogether taken out of a vast amount of religious controversies. Men again and again when discussing a question, entirely neglect the facts of the case, in their anxiety to establish a theory upon a dogmatic basis. Thus it is that they rush away to seek how many texts they can quote, or how many passages of Holy Scripture they can mutilate and distort in order to support their own theory. Now, in such a question as the freedom of man, or the freedom of the Will, which you will notice is only another way of stating the problem of the relation of man to the Almighty, I would urge you to look upon it apart from any dogmatic assertion whatsoever. Look at the question calmly, and find the material for investigation and illustration in the facts of your own conscious life. And do not be afraid of any charge of unorthodoxy that may be made against the conclusion that your own observation presses upon you. We need, no doubt, to be very modest, for error may slip in. But think for yourself, be not content with the mere acceptation of the second or third-hand thoughts of others; and remember that God's orthodoxy is truth.

Now, in order to understand the question aright, may I remind you what precisely we mean when we speak of "Will." Will is the power of self-determination. When, by intelligence, we recognise what we ought to do, then by "Will" we control our impulses and other powers in order that we may carry into effect the dictates of intelligence. Now, besides the dictates of intelligence, our affections and desires are also forces within us, impelling us to action; affections arising out of the fulness of our natures, desires arising out of the wants of our nature. Now all these, the judgments of the mind, the desires and affections of which we are conscious, all these we usually speak of as "motives." The point in dispute is this, whether motives in this sense determine the will, or whether the will has power superior to motives. On the one hand, it is asserted that "will" is an effect, which follows its corresponding causes as certainly and invariably as physical effects follow their physical causes. The only difference at this point between Necessitarians of the Materialistic school, and Calvinists, as they are usually called, of the religious world, is that the latter include the special and irresistible grace of God given to this or that man, and which thus ranks as first of the various motives compelling his conduct. The law of causality is regarded as one of the universal laws of Nature, and when its application to the region of mind is to some extent denied by Libertarians, then it is asserted that the free-will theory and the laws revealed by science, are at variance. Now, it is of importance to see what precisely is meant, when the application of the law of causality to the region of the mind is denied. It is not meant that "will" is an uncaused event, every volition has its cause; but what is denied is this—that the inner world of mind and the outer world of Nature are so far analogous, that the law must work alike in both. In the region of mind, "attendant circumstances" do not determine causes with the same certainty as they do in the physical sphere. In the region of the mind there is power of self-adjustment, which is not found in the other. We say that under the ordinary circumstances it is certain that friction will produce heat; but you cannot say that, under ordinary circumstances, there is the same certainty that provocation will produce anger. In short, man is not, so to speak, a bundle of forces which, being set in motion, is compelled to move in the direction of, and with a velocity proportioned to, the strongest impulse. Motives arise within us as circumstances call them forth; their nature is to solicit us to action, or they tend even to compel us, but we recognise within us a power of determining whether we will act in accordance with the impulse, and whether, if we act at all, we will act in this direction or that. Of course, man is seldom acted upon by a single motive. In all actions involving moral quality several motives act upon the man at the same time. These motives, too, are so diverse in their nature that they solicit man to action in various conflicting directions. With the hesitation produced whilst a man deliberates, weighs over the probable results of action in any given direction, or the rightness or wrongfulness of the action, in this very deliberation and hesitation we have free self-government in the man begun. It is not that we feel we can give any decision we like, or that we feel beforehand that we can judge this or that to be right or advantageous as we please. But rather that, whilst we are hesitating and deliberating as to whether we will carry our judgment into action, we are conscious that, whilst we do thus hesitate and deliberate, it is I myself who am hesitating and deliberating. This is the direct evidence that a man has of the freedom of his willing power.

At this point it might be easy to reply that, after all, it comes much to the same thing. For what really happens is this: when a man is solicited to act in a given direction, he may either act straightway without reflection, or he may test the action by reference to the law of God revealed by conscience. In the latter case, the more he attends to the law of duty, by so much does he diminish the strength of the desire soliciting him in the contrary direction. So that the concentration of attention upon the law has brought into existence another motive which, if it be sufficiently strong, may over-ride the desire and necessitate the will. So then it might be said man is still a necessary and not a free agent. But the objection is, after all, of not much weight. It only serves to make more clear where the core of the problem really lies. The concentration of attention upon the pure law—this does, no doubt, bring into existence a new motive. But it is just this very *concentration* of our attention which is the crucial point. It is there that freedom is exercised. Man can please himself whether he will or no confine his attention in any given direction. "Pay attention" is the earliest command to our infant years, and the whole of our infant education was intended to impress upon us the necessity, and therefore the possibility, of confining our attention to matters which were not those which our desires would choose. So, then, though conduct is decided by motives, the will is yet free and supreme. The act of attention by which weaker motives are held in suspense, this is a voluntary act, so that the final statement of the question would seem to be this—that though the strongest motive governs conduct, yet it is the will which decides which motive shall absorb attention, and thus gain strength so as ultimately to become the strongest.

This conclusion as to the freedom of the will may seem only to touch the very hem of the great question as to the relation of us finite creatures to the infinite and eternal God. But although it leaves much untouched, yet it seems to remind us of one essential truth. Mental science confirms in this way the familiar belief and teaching of the bulk of the Christian Church in all ages, that man's destiny is in his own hands. God has given to man that power of adjusting his own circumstances that any assertion of predestination in its personal extreme sense is a contradiction. Election in the sense of our circumstances and surroundings being made for us and not by us, this is simple and obvious enough. But that we are not the necessary result of the election or the circumstances, is the plain testimony of man's conscious life. At the last great day, when an account must be rendered, no man will be able to urge his circumstances or election as excuse for unfaithfulness. Whether, in some extreme cases the circumstances may have given rise to an invincible prejudice, and thus form some excuse, is not for us to say—but this we do know, that the Judge of all the earth will do right. But for us the still small voice which speaks saying: "Thou oughtest," awakes a no less certain echo within, which says: "Because I ought, therefore I can." It is the familiar truth that God lays no heavier burden upon us than we may bear. And even with us whose wills have become enfeebled, whose judgment has, through evil bias, become untrustworthy, for such there is hope in Christ. This is the Gospel, the good news, that in the Lord Jesus there is life for the dead, there is sight for the blind. Again and again, have men like the poor prodigal in the far-off land, come to themselves. And when they are willing to face the old, hard road of repentance, of humility, of amendment—then they ever find the help they need, and the pardon for which they crave. And to-day the same voice calls you, the same grace is offered to you. O that to-day you would hear His voice and harden not your hearts.

◆

THE rectory of Kelly, Devon, has lately become vacant by the resignation from ill-health of the Rev. I. P. Prescott, who was instituted in 1882.

THE Rev. G. F. Browne, of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, has issued a fly-sheet with reference to the memorial in favour of admitting women to a degree. He says that if the views of the committee which has circulated the memorial are pressed, there will be a separation in Cambridge between one portion and another of the friends of the higher education of women; while, in a considerable number of cases, that passive good will which has been of much quiet help there will be converted into hostility. Earnestly desiring, as he does, the encouragement and advancement of the higher education of women, Mr. Browne sees no justification for making hazardous and unnecessary experiments upon the constitution of the University. "The Universities have recently entered upon a new phase of internal work, and they hold a position in the country such as they have never held before. When the work on hand is so great, and the immediate future seems so full of promise, it appears to me specially unwise to enter upon prolonged agitation for grave changes in our constitution. The result of the proposals of the committee would be to give to women full membership of the University. And if that were obtained, it would only be the beginning of a series of agitations, with objects which will readily occur to any one familiar with our University and College arrangements. Having regard to the best interests of the higher education of women, I venture to urge that it should be left free to expand independently of the higher education of men." He proceeds to suggest that all desirable ends would be secured by the simple expedient of a central representative body, with a charter empowering it to confer degrees upon women who have passed the examinations of Universities which do not confer degrees upon women, or such other examinations as it may institute or approve. "Women who pass their examinations here would become 'B.A. (Camb.),' their sisters at Oxford 'B.A. (Oxf.).' They might proceed to other degrees. The operations of such a body would be not local in scope, but national—possibly even imperial. It would become rich and powerful. It would have its scholarships, fellowships, professorships, held at one or other of the centres of residence; its senate. Whatever the future of women's education may be, it would be guided with a sole view to the interests of the education of women. And all would go on here as now, smoothly and pleasantly."

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and all Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials **FREE OF CHARGE** may be had on application to Medical Battery Co. Ld.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1887.

UNCHANGED REBELLION.

IN one of his pithy letters Mr. Bright has put the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth of the Irish question. "It is my sympathy for the Irish people which forces me into strong opposition to the political views of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell. The latter, as far as I know, has not changed. The former, five years ago, condemned and denounced him. Now he comes forward as his apologist and defender." In a preceding passage Mr. Bright speaks of the revolutionary and rebel conspiracy with which the Government is now contending, so that there can be no doubt of his opinion of the character which Mr. Parnell and his followers have borne all along, and which Mr. Bright now declares to be unaltered. This is a fact which cannot be too strongly impressed upon public attention. We are so apt to lose sight of the past that we are prone to interpret the acts and words of the Parnellite party by the standard of Messrs. Gladstone, Harcourt, and Morley, rather than by the standard of Ford, Egan, and Brady. Thousands of Englishmen will listen to a speech by Mr. Dillon, or Mr. T. P. O'Connor without a thought ever passing through their minds as to the former association of their National or Land League with the men who planned the murders in the Phœnix Park. To correct this tendency it is only necessary to bear in mind Mr. Bright's warning that the Irish conspiracy is unchanged. It has modified its methods, with the view of making the most of the Gladstonian alliance; but its aims are the same as ever, and, if necessary, it will resort to the old means. Indeed even now the tail of the conspiracy does not stick at mutilation and murder, and other acts of intimidation, though its head may be lifted among a company of constitutional statesmen. When once this fundamental fact is grasped, it is wonderful how much corroboration of it one sees in matters that would otherwise pass unnoticed. In the last received issue of the *Irish World* there is a letter from Michael Davitt to "Dear Mr. Ford," dated from Ballybrack, Co., Dublin, Sept. 10th, 1887. It deals with the "fight" at Mitchelstown, and is rebel from beginning to end. Michael Davitt is now staying in Chicago with Egan. Now Ford and Egan are acknowledged leaders of the apologists of dynamite and murder. Clearly therefore, Davitt is unchanged. Again, Father O'Leary, a priest from the United States, has been addressing a meeting in County Limerick. He "declared that the Irish people were rebels and revolutionists at heart, and God forbid that they should ever be otherwise; for the moment they ceased to rebel they would cease to be good Irishmen. He was a rebel himself, and as a priest he offered the sanction of his sacred position to the most extreme form of Irish Nationalism provided it was prudently and efficaciously conducted." Will any reasonable man say that the Government is not justified in visiting Father O'Leary with the most extreme form of the penalties incurred by rebels? There is no doubt that Father O'Leary spoke the exact truth. Home Rule may be a constitutional movement at Westminster and in England, but on the hillsides and on the plains of Ireland it is a murderous revolt against English rule in any shape or form. Therein lies the political justification of such measures as the Crimes Act. No Government is justified in permitting its authority to be flouted and defied. Mr. O'Brien refused to attend on the Mitchelstown summons, and had to be arrested on a warrant. He will now it is said refuse to obey the summons for publishing in *United Ireland* the proceedings of suppressed branches of the League; while general instructions have been sent round that no persons summoned under the Crimes Act should surrender, but shall compel the authorities to arrest them. This, if not rebellion is contempt and contumacy, and cannot be tolerated for a moment. Defiance of the laws means the subversion of society; while the mark of civilisation is the constitutional change of laws found to be unjust or inconvenient. It is impossible to vary these alternatives; and it is equally impossible to suppose that the Parnellite leopard has changed his spots or softened down his ferocity.

AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. DÖLLINGER.

THE Rev. J. P. Sandlands, Vicar of Brigstock, had an interview with Dr. Döllinger at Tegernsee some little time ago. The conversation turned easily and naturally on Mr. Gladstone, with whom, as they were neighbours last year, the Doctor had had many opportunities of talking. The points of interest, on which the Doctor gave his opinion, were the following: (1) Mr. Gladstone as a Statesman, (2) Mr. Gladstone compared with Prince Bismarck.

(1) Mr. Gladstone as a Statesman.—Dr. Döllinger is one of his many admirers. He thinks he is very eloquent, but allows that he makes mistakes. Mr. Sandlands suggested that he often changed his mind. The Doctor replied, all statesmen do, and must. Palmerston, Peel, and Disraeli had all done so. Mr. Sandlands referred to the principles of right and wrong, and said they were eternal. The Doctor replied: "True, but the application of them changed." Instances were introduced, illustrating what Mr. Sandlands considered were not merely different applications of right principles, and in particular the Irish Church question. The Doctor allowed that in this case he was not in a position to decide. He said that it appeared to him that in the disestablishment of the Irish Church a grievance was removed. He was prepared, however, to admit that other and greater grievances were occasioned by it. Mr. Sandlands here quoted Archdeacon Denison's opinion, which he gave as nearly as he could remember in these words: "Mr. Gladstone has profound reasoning powers, but no intuitions" [deficient in the moral sense]. The Doctor said he was not prepared to admit this. He said, notwithstanding, that Mr. Gladstone had a strange faculty for collecting fancies and regarding them as facts. Here Dr. Döllinger referred to his conversations with Mr. Gladstone on the subject of Home Rule last year. He condemned *in toto* Mr. Gladstone's views on this subject, and said that "Home Rule would be bad for Ireland and bad for England." Mr. Sandlands suggested that these views rather coincided with than differed from those of the Archdeacon's; but the Doctor was still inclined to hold to the opinion that Mr. Gladstone was conscientious in believing his fancies to be facts.

(2) Mr. Gladstone compared with Prince Bismarck.—Here Mr. Sandlands suggested that Mr. Gladstone acted from very different principles from Prince Bismarck. He put the matter in this form: Mr. Gladstone asks, What do the people want? Prince Bismarck asks, What is best for the people? The Doctor replied that Prince Bismarck did not find it always an easy matter to determine what to do; but, he said, he knows when to bend. In this matter, he said, he was like our Queen Elizabeth. Mr. S. suggested that, perhaps, he yielded in little matters that he might succeed in greater ones. He replied: "There might be something in this." Mr. Sandlands asked, if the Prince had not done a great deal for Germany, and if he were not the greatest statesman of the day. To these statements he yielded ready assent, adding: "Prince Bismarck is a great statesman; but he cannot arouse enthusiam. His speeches are to be read, not to be heard. They do not move people in the delivering, they are too thoughtful and too practical." The Doctor did not say so in so many words, but it is more than possible that while he thinks Prince Bismarck a practical statesman, dealing with things as they are, he considers Mr. Gladstone a sort of dreamer, who deals with things as he imagines them to be.

THE Rev. W. Handcock, vicar of St. Matthew's, West Kensington-park, has resigned the living.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

MR. BENNETT—PRESENCE QUESTION.

SIR,—This controversy having gone on for some time between a lady and a Canon—a lady whose learning and skill all must admire—would it not be well to end this personal matter, and come to the abstract questions connected with it?

What did the Privy Council really say as to Mr. Bennett's adoration? I quote from p. 243 of Brookes's "Six Judgments:" "Some of their lordships have doubted whether the word 'adore,' though it seems to point rather to acts of worship, such as are forbidden by the 28th Article, may not be construed to refer to mental adoration, or prayers addressed to Christ present spiritually in the Sacrament, which does not necessarily imply any adoration of the consecrated elements, or of any corporal or natural presence therein."

What is here sanctioned is, adoration of Christ spiritually present, as opposed to a local or natural presence of His Body, locally present in Heaven alone. This spiritual presence, or virtual presence, or presence by effects, is all the same. It is the only conceivable presence that is not a local one. Of this the healing by the brazen serpent is an instance; so is the virtue going out of our Lord to heal the woman; the same, "there went virtue out of Him and healed them all," Luke vi. 19; and "the power of the Lord was (present) to heal them." Again, the shadow of Peter may be another illustration.

The *Church Times* and the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* condemn this idea as heretical. It is put forth by us not only as Catholic, but also as the only one reconcilable with our Articles, Communion Service, Catechism, and Black Rubric.

While it is confessed that our Lord's natural Body cannot be locally in more places than one, it is unreasonable to say, as an illustration of some other mode of presence, that the twelve loaves and the fishes were locally in more places than one, for to feed the people they could not be present at all other than naturally. The illustration would prove what the Black Rubric denies.

The presence may be called mysterious, because we do not know how it is. And yet we can state what we believe, when we say that its presence is like that of the sun, locally absent.

It is absurd to say that the Virtualists are the uncharitable party. All that they say is, that their opinion alone is to be reconciled to the Prayer-book. The two periodicals condemn it as a heresy of which the primitive Church was "not even patient." I can quote chapter and verse, if required.

AN OLD-FASHIONED DIVINE.

P.S.—It is one thing to worship Christ as everywhere present, another to worship a soul-healing grace, proceeding from His Body absent in Heaven. If "effects" and "virtue" are new terms, *species* is not. It is a denial that the substance of bread remains, learnt from Rome.

CLERICAL SEMINARIES.

SIR,—I see that a plea on behalf of the above has been put forward at the Church Congress by Rev. E. R. Christie, of Magdalene College School. I think, therefore, that attention should be drawn to the question. I cannot do better than quote from a leading article in the *Times* (Oct. 5): "Mr. Christie, a Master of Magdalene College School at Oxford, is concerned that in England our clergy often do not know that they are going to be clergy until the age of twenty-two. He advocates the Roman seminary system, and the education of priests begun when the candidates are children. To which we can only say we trust that that is not a system to which the authorities of Magdalene College School lend any kind of countenance. The strength of the English clergy comes from the fact that they are men, and not sacerdotal machines; that they have been brought up in a healty lay atmosphere, and only became clergymen when they were of age to be assured of their vocation. We should regard any other system of instruction with the most invincible repugnance, and we are convinced that the people of England would do the same." These are weighty words. They give no "uncertain sound," but say plainly and forcibly that, as for the Roman seminary system, we will have none of it. For it means the putting into conventual institutions, children of tender age where they will be kept in an unhealthy sentimental atmosphere, until with subjugated will and impaired judgment they are fitted to become the puppets or machines of priestly "directors." Of course this all means the glorification of clerical celibacy as if it was the narrow way that leads to heaven, as if abstinence from marriage meant "mortification of the flesh"; at least, so I have heard a Ritualist express himself. But let any impartial person visit Ireland, and see the usual types of Romish parish priests and curates; they are all "celibates," indeed, "virgins" (as they are called!), but what evidence is there in their countenances of austerity, or "mortification," or even decent moderation? None whatever? Their visages are coarse, sensual, "of the earth, earthy"—yet they have been brought up from childhood to think marriage a sin. They may get drunk, lie, steal, commit adultery—all these may be washed away by absolution, but if a priest marries his soul will be damned eternally! And this is the system that Mr. Christie would fain introduce into our Protestant Reformed Church. All I can say is, "God forbid!" Let the boys be reared in healthy, happy English homes or schools, mix freely with others of their own age, and then when they come to "years of discretion," let them of their own free will choose the ministry or any other honourable calling or profession which attracts them. OXONIENSIS.

A CONTRAST.

SIR,—I ask to be allowed to present briefly a contrast between two sets of doctrines, on the purposes of God towards the race of Adam. I wish to state both as I understand them, without omitting or adding anything that can produce a false impression.

The system called orthodox represents that the object and design of the Scheme of Redemption through Christ, is to gather together a Church which shall glorify God, and shall be holy and happy for ever. The persons composing that Church must be united to Christ in this life.

All those who are not united to Christ in this life will be abandoned by God to endless, hopeless depravity and misery.

Although this representation is preached throughout England under the title of the Gospel, or Glad Tidings, it has to my mind a most dismal aspect, and I feel convinced that its effects on human character and conduct have been and are most disastrous.

The system called Universalism, as I understand and hold it, may be stated in the following propositions:

God is the Father of all His intelligent creatures, and it is His firm purpose to train all for a safe, holy and happy immortality.

All will acquire enlightened freedom, to be wisely guided by the individual mind.

The necessary measure to secure those important objects, rendered the entrance of moral evil unavoidable.

The nature, tendencies and effects of moral evil must be clearly and forcibly exhibited to the comprehension of intelligent beings, by processes of painful discipline, and all must be delivered from its sway.

The Scheme of Redemption through Christ, with its tender appeal to the affections, and its wondrous potency of spiritual influence, has complete resources to accomplish those great purposes.

The principle of Election contemplates the attainment of universal objects, through the Church and not merely restricted holiness and happiness.

Heaven is not like a Mahommedan paradise, divested of licentious features. It rather resembles illimitable fields for earnest and most congenial efforts to win the universe to Christ. The elect from all quarters will be engaged in the blessed work. Election is for service and not for enjoyment, although the bliss connected with the service is of the most elevated nature.

I firmly believe that the foregoing propositions may be proved by a careful and prayerful consideration of the grand volumes of Inspiration, Nature and Providence.

J. B.

Canonbury, October 10th, 1887.

* * *

DR. LUCKOCK, candidate for the Lady Margaret Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge, has issued an additional letter to the electors in the following terms:—

"Ely, Oct. 10, 1887.

"My dear Sir,--I desire to add a few words to my address, which you will have received, touching my candidature for the Lady Margaret Professorship.

"Two or three persons well qualified for the office have stood aside in favour of the Hulsean Professor, who has been urged to offer himself as a candidate for what is considered a more honourable chair. I do not yield to any one in admiration for his learning and critical scholarship, but on the following grounds I have thought it my duty (and not a few of the electors have approved of my decision) to leave the matter in the hands of those with whom the election rests.

"To allow the succession to this Professorship again to go unchallenged would have a tendency to establish what might hereafter prove to be an inconvenient precedent.

"Again I wish to emphasise my aim in seeking this office. It is to provide more systematic teaching of pastoral theology in the University. There is unfortunately no chair at Cambridge, as at Oxford, necessarily appropriated to this branch of theology; but few persons, especially since the alteration in the University Statutes, would deny its importance. It is a very significant fact that on the recommendation of the Board of Theological Studies 'that it is urgently necessary that provision should be made for an annual course of lectures on Homiletics and Pastoral Theology,' for the last five years it has been thought necessary to appoint a lecturer, outside the Professoriate, at an expense to the University of £100 a year, save on the first occasion, when the Lady Margaret Professor contributed it himself.

"One of the lecturers so appointed told me that the interest excited by the lectures which he delivered was far beyond all his expectations, and that they led to much useful correspondence after he had left with men who had attended them. It pointed to the desirableness of having a resident Professor to whom candidates for holy orders might resort at all times for help and counsel touching their future work.

"It seemed to me that such a Professor was more likely to be appointed to the Lady Margaret than to any other of the Divinity chairs. Perhaps the best remembered and certainly the most useful lectures on pastoral theology were those delivered by Mr. Blunt when Lady Margaret Professor. The electoral body for this Professorship is a wide one, embracing many of the Bishops, not a few of the examining chaplains, and clergy engaged in parochial work, all of whom would presumably realise more clearly than a purely academical board of electors the need of the fullest instruction in the office and work of the ministry for those who proceed to ordination direct from the University.

"I may have altogether over-estimated the present need, and if the judgment of the electors shows that this is the case I shall be well satisfied that the appointment will be one which must shed additional lustre over a chair which has been held by some of the foremost of English divines from the Reformation onwards."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beach, Rev. Canon, W. R., late Principal Chaplain to the Forces at Aldershot; Rector of North Fambridge, Essex.
Beck, Rev. William John, Rector of Sutton Montis, Somersetshire.
Bremridge, Rev. Henry, M.A., Curate; Vicar of Winkleigh, North Devon.
Claughton, Rev. T. L., M.A., late Vicar of Kidderminster; Rector of St. Andrew's, Worcester.
Colley, Rev. Alfred Noel, M.A., Curate of Ross, Herefordshire; Vicar of Great Baddow, Essex.
Hargrove, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Vicar of Silsoe, Bedford; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Cambridge.
Hotham, Rev. Charles George Beaumont, M.A., Rector of Theydon Garnon, Essex.
King, Rev. Herbert P., late Curate of Dursley; Rector of Stourton, Wilts.
Rouse, Rev. R. C. M., M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Woodbridge; Rector of Rayleigh, Essex.
Shepherd, Rev. James, Vicar of Askham Bryan, York.
Simpson, Rev. G. T., late Curate and Curate-in-Charge of St. Peter's, Southwark; Missionary in the Diocese of Winchester.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Faussett, Rev. Godfrey Godfrey, at 10, Oxford Parade, Cheltenham, on the 8th inst., aged 74.
Harris, Rev. Charles, M.A., formerly Incumbent of St. Mary's, Summers Town, Tooting, at Weston-super-Mare, on the 6th inst., aged 66.

The Church of England Pulpit.

MICAIAH.

By Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday, August 28th, 1887.

"And Jehoshaphat said, Is there not here a prophet of the Lord besides, that we might inquire of him? And the King of Israel said unto Jehoshaphat, There is yet one man, Micaiah, the son of Imlah, by whom we may inquire of the Lord; but I hate him; for he doth not prophecy good concerning me, but evil."—1 Kings xxii. 7, 8.

THE first lesson of the morning service to-day brings us to the close of an unhappy life—that of Ahab, king of Israel. It is remarkable that in the last scenes we find him intimately associated with Jehoshaphat, one of the most religious of the descendants of David. Probably the growing power of Syria led these kings to feel the political necessity of an alliance for defensive purposes, and this feeling took a practical shape on the day, so unfortunate for the kingdom of Judah, when Jehoshaphat's eldest son Jehoram was married to Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab. It was apparently the recent domestic tie between the families that led Jehoshaphat to pay Ahab a friendly visit in his capital of Samaria; and during this visit a question was raised which led to the military expedition in which Ahab lost his life. It seems that in the lifetime of Ahab's father, Omri, the Syrians had taken Ramoth-Gilead, and although Ahab had since imposed a treaty upon the son of the Syrian conqueror, under the terms of which that stronghold was to be restored to Israel, no such restoration had ever taken place, and the Syrians still occupied it in force. And thus it came to pass that one day during Jehoshaphat's visit the king of Israel said unto his servants, "Know ye that Ramoth in Gilead is ours, and we be still, and take it not out of the hand of the king of Syria?" It may have occurred to Ahab's advisers that Israel alone was not a match for the growing power of Damascus, and this led Ahab to ask Jehoshaphat whether he would join in an expedition for the recapture of Ramoth-Gilead. Jehoshaphat readily consented, but, with his wonted piety, he begged Ahab that the will of the Lord should in some way be ascertained. This King Ahab proposed to do by consulting four hundred prophets who were connected with the worship of Jehovah under the symbols of golden calves which Jeroboam had set up at Bethel and Dan; and the prophets thus consulted unanimously advised the expedition, which would, they said confidently, be successful. But Jehoshaphat was still dissatisfied. These prophets were not true prophets of the Lord; they were in separation from the old religion of Israel, and Jehoshaphat naturally wished to know what a prophet would say who was loyal to the worship of God at Jerusalem. And then Ahab gave the significant answer: "There is yet one man, Micaiah, the son of Imlah, by whom we may inquire of the Lord; but," he added, "I hate him; for he doth not prophecy good concerning me, but evil."

Ahab probably thought of the recapture of Ramoth Gilead as a duty which he owed to his subjects and to his office. He was, as a public man, by no means deficient in activity, and he was anxious to promote the interests and extend the limits of his realm, as he understood them. This is observable in his public works, which were considerable undertakings. Ahab, too, was an experienced soldier, and he may have wished to bequeath to his son the full extent of territory over which his father had once reigned. No doubt the Syrians were a powerful people, but in two wars against them Ahab had triumphed. In the one he had utterly routed Ben-hadad, who was besieging Samaria. In the other Ben-hadad had invaded Israel from the east of the Jordan, and Ahab's victory was still more complete. Ben-hadad himself was taken prisoner, and was only released on condition of restoring all the cities of Israel which the Syrians had taken, and of allowing a factory of Hebrew traders to settle in Damascus. Ahab, then, might naturally have hoped to succeed in a third and more decisive war. He held himself to be quite within his rights in attempting to recover Ramoth-Gilead. Did it not belong to Israel? Were not the Syrians violating their own engagements in keeping possession of it? Was not Ahab doing his simple duty as a king in endeavouring to recover it? This was how the matter may have presented itself to Ahab. Men of the world make up their minds as to what they mean to do on grounds independent of religion; but they are not sorry to be able to produce plausible moral and religious reasons for their course of action. For the true and adequate consideration of the question Ahab had neither heart nor inclination. Granted that the restoration of its ancient limits to the territory of Israel was a kingly duty, it was also, viewed religiously, a high privilege. But the privilege of high service is not, in the Divine judgment, always and everywhere open to everybody. It does not follow that when some public work has to be done for God or for His Church, the man who is by office the natural man to do it is morally and religiously well fitted to do it. The Promised Land had to be conquered, but the great leader who had brought Israel through the wilderness was not permitted, for religious reasons, to cross the Jordan. The Temple had to be built, but even David could not build it, because he was a man who had shed much blood. And if the integrity of the kingdom of Israel was to be restored, it must be restored by other hands than those of a king whose weak character, though not devoid of some amiable characteristics, but entirely controlled by his unscrupulous and depraved wife, had led him into so much wickedness. Ahab was under the solemn ban pronounced by Elijah after the murder of Naboth, and although this did not prevent him in succeeding in defensive warfare, it might forbid success when he was taking the offensive. The religious view of a matter like this would have been treated by Ahab, we may be sure, with great impatience. Until a man has learned to look at life from the higher point of view, he cannot understand why he should be religiously disqualified for anything that he chooses to attempt. Religion, he probably thinks, like fire, "is a good servant, but a bad master"—a useful sanction, if it can be had, for enterprises which are resolved on independently of it, but an intolerable intruder if it presumes to interfere with or to condemn them. For Ahab religion was very satisfactorily represented by the four hundred prophets who were under the leadership of that impetuous, though pliant courtier, Zedekiah. These four hundred prophets would of themselves have had no prepossessions either for or against the expedition, and they might be safely depended on for saying just what Ahab wished. Their facile obsequiousness threw out into sharper and more unwelcome relief the fearless independence of Micaiah. It helps us to understand the hatred with which Ahab regarded him. And here we may stop in order to observe that, deeply interesting as are the political and historical bearings of the narrative, they are not by any means its highest interest. It is most interesting as showing, on the one hand, how courageously the cause of truth and duty may be defended in very difficult circumstances, and on the other, how piteously the human soul may vacillate and waver when confronted by what it suspects to be the truth. We have here an admirable lesson on the consistent intrepidity in which truth and duty may be insisted on in difficult circumstances. Let us, then, fix our attention on the figure, the great figure, of Micaiah.

He is not one of the prophets who are prominent in sacred history. He has left no writings that we know of; and as a man of action he is entirely overshadowed by his great contemporary Elijah. But Micaiah belongs to that sacred line of fearless witnesses for God, who know how to respect earthly greatness, yet for whom earthly greatness has neither charms nor terrors; and who appear in royal courts but to speak in the name of the King of kings. Such was Moses before Pharaoh, crying "Let my people go"; such was Nathan before David, proclaiming "Thou art the man"; such was Elijah before Ahab, saying, "It is thou that troublest Israel"; such was Nehemiah before Artaxerxes; and, greatest of them all, such was St. John the Baptist before Herod Antipas, with his simple fearless message—"It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife." To this line of chosen souls, the very chivalry of the saints, belongs Micaiah. Incapable of any gratuitous disrespect to any earthly ruler, but still more incapable of winning a king's favour by saying what was not true, the work of Micaiah's life was to maintain in schismatic and apostate Israel the claims of Revelation, which had its centre and seat in Jerusalem. Micaiah could not often say what was agreeable to Ahab without being false to his own deepest religious convictions, and he had no doubt already had interviews with Ahab not recorded in Holy Scripture, such as that which Josephus mentions, and which had impressed Ahab with a vivid sense of the prophet's uncompromising and fearless character. So Ahab knew instinctively what Micaiah would say on the matter in hand. Ahab in his secret soul knew well enough that in Micaiah's case the opposition to himself was in no sense the fruit of a personal antagonism or prejudice.

But Ahab—in this, perhaps, resembling the first Napoleon more than anybody else—tried to persuade others, and in the end to persuade himself, that whatever was said or done in opposition to his wishes, was done or said from the low motive of personal spite. "I hate him, for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil." Certainly Ahab was not wrong in anticipating an adverse answer from Micaiah, but as Jehoshaphat was not satisfied with the answer of the four hundred prophets, and as Ahab himself may have had misgivings, a eunuch was sent to fetch Micaiah; and then there followed a scene which must long have dwelt in the memory of those who witnessed it. In a gate of Samaria, probably on the road to Jezreel, the kings of Israel and Judah sat both of them on their portable thrones, while all the prophets prophesied before them. At their head was Zedekiah, who now appeared with horns of iron in his hands, as the prophetic emblems of the power which would conquer the enemy. The four hundred followed the guidance of Zedekiah, and they declared that Ahab might go to Ramoth-Gilead, "for Jehovah shall deliver it into the king's hand." The eunuch who went to fetch Micaiah entreated him not to break the harmony of the proceedings by prophesying in any other sense than that of the four hundred; but the prophet answered as Balaam had answered centuries before, that he must speak as he is bidden from above. At Micaiah's appearance Ahab inquired, "Shall we go against Ramoth-Gilead to battle, or shall we forbear?" "Go and prosper," replied Micaiah, "for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king." Micaiah's manner must have convinced Ahab that the prophet's real meaning was something very different from that of his words, that he was only repeating in an ironical way the shouted plaudits of the four hundred, and Ahab urged Micaiah to tell him nothing but the plain truth. And then Micaiah uttered his forecast with dread solemnity. He drew a picture of the moral result of the coming defeat: "I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills as sheep that have not a shepherd; and the Lord said, These have no master; let them return every man to his house in peace." And then, feeling that he must justify his own dissent from Zedekiah and the four hundred, Micaiah proceeded to narrate a vision which showed how and why they had been deceived. They were but dupes, he said, of an evil agency permitted to lead Ahab onwards to his ruin. Such bold language could not be forgiven. "And the king of Israel said, Take Micaiah, and carry him back unto Amon, the governor of the city, and to Joash the king's son: and say, Thus saith the king, Put this fellow in the prison, and feed him with the bread of affliction and with the water of affliction, until I come in peace."

Now, observe the great courage and dignity of Micaiah's bearing before Ahab. Poor, unconspicuous, unbefriended, he stands out as a solitary witness to unwelcome truth before a contemptuous court and an angry king. Even the pious Jehoshaphat does not interfere in his favour, and is not governed by his advice. Micaiah speaks to no purpose, his advice is forgotten, except that he is punished for giving it. He might seem to have no place in a scene where servility and passion carry all before them, and he had to witness the insolent triumph of Zedekiah as he himself was led off to his prison. It is comparatively easy to bear witness to truth when a large public sympathises with you; but to be a Micaiah, to encounter nothing but a wall of impenetrable prejudice, to speak with the knowledge that the most unworthy motives will be attributed to you, to speak as to the winds without having any visible influence on the conduct of other men or on the course of events, and to take the consequences, failure and suffering, with all the dignity of resignation to the Divine Will—this is a great grace; and Micaiah ranks, we may be sure, high among the ancient servants of God. And in all ages of Christendom, and in all ranks of life, a Micaiah is again and again needed, and he has his successors. The simple courage which refuses to acquiesce in what is wrong, or to say that wrong is right, only because wrong is powerfully recommended, is never wholly wanting. In many a public school, in many a family, in many an office of business, in boards and committees, in Parliaments, and in Church gatherings there are from time to time cries for some fantastic expedition to Ramoth-Gilead, for some course of conduct which gratifies social ambition, or the instinct of mischief, or which is likely to satisfy the love of wealth, or which is demanded by wounded self-love or personal animosity—something which falls in with the ruling prejudice or enthusiasm of the hour, but which is in itself wrong. And the schoolboy who will not join in some organised mischief or rebellion, the member of the family who will not sanction a dishonourable, though advantageous, contract; the clerk or the young officer who raises his voice against fashionable profligacy; the committee-man or Minister of the Crown who resigns his place rather than violate his conscience; the Bishop or the churchman who puts truth and justice before the voice of some uninformed majority—these, in their various ways, are Micaiahs. To be right with the many is indeed a blessing, if it can be had; to be right and yet alone may be a higher distinction: "Among the faithless, faithful only he."

But this history also illustrates the inconsistency, the astonishing inconsistency and vacillation of which a man's soul may be guilty in dealing with recognised or suspected truth—truth which it will not frankly accept, and yet which it dare not finally reject. The trial of Royalty in all ages is its isolation. Few courtiers will risk their place by offering advice which, however sound, is known to be unwelcome; and a king sees his ideas and wishes reflected in—not corrected by—the minds of those around him. The isolation of the Throne, and the immense moral disadvantages which it consequently entails on its occupant, is one reason among others for joining earnestly in those prayers for the Sovereign which have always been a conspicuous feature of the services of the Church of Christ. But crowned heads are not by any means the only people who are liable to this practical moral isolation—it may befall anyone in a position of influence or command—trusted leaders of opinion, bishops, employers of labour. Any of us may be thus isolated as we get on in life and become heads of families, with children, servants, looking up to us, but never venturing to offer us sincere advice. Exactly in the degree in which time and circumstances force us into a position of this kind should we welcome the voice of any Micaiah, who will not join with all the rest in the cry "Go up to Ramoth Gilead." The aged Eli could even listen to the voice of the child Samuel though it was telling of his own future humiliation and punishment; and Ahab might have learned from Micaiah enough to have saved him from the bloody death to which he was rushing. And, indeed, Ahab might seem to have been, to a certain extent, alive to this danger. He could not escape from the truth while yet he was angry with it; he treated it as though it had a sort of grudge against himself; and, while apparently deferring to it, ended by defying it and perished accordingly.

It would seem that Ahab could not divest himself of the belief that Micaiah's advice was better worth listening to than he admitted in words. During the interview his anxiety to get at Micaiah's real mind is very remarkable. Micaiah taking Ahab at his word, as a monarch who liked to have agreeable things said to him, mockingly repeated the chant of the four hundred; and if Ahab had had no belief in Micaiah's authority, he would not have cared to hear him further; but he does insist with great earnestness that he should tell him nothing but "what is true in the name of the Lord." And once more, what showed that Ahab could not treat Micaiah's word as simple falsehood was this—why did Ahab disguise himself when he went into the battle? To do so was inconsistent with usage, inconsistent with his personal dignity as king and leader of his people, inconsistent with the safety of his guest Jehoshaphat, inconsistent with the discipline of his army and the best interests of the very enterprise which he had at heart. But for all that Ahab could not help it; Micaiah's picture of Israel as sheep without a shepherd haunted him. At any rate, he would try to avoid his predicted fate by not offering himself as a target for the Syrian archers; but he could not, indeed, take precautions against that "bow drawn at a venture," and he showed in his disobedience how little he was able to rid himself of the empire of the truth. He is most anxious to extract the real truth from the prophet; he insults and imprisons the prophet for giving it; and yet he acts in his last moments as though he suspected, after all, that the message might be true. Nothing can be more irrational, and yet must we not add, nothing can be truer to the instincts of human nature. We need not go far for parallels of this in our own day. Passionate rejection of the claims of the Christian Creed, coupled with sincere anxiety to know exactly what it does and does not teach, show that its claims are not altogether set aside as worthless. Such is the secret penetrating power of truth, extorting homage from the most reluctant wills, winning victories where they could be the least expected, and being "ruler even in the midst of its enemies."

Once more, we have here a sample of the disposition so deeply rooted in the human mind to seek in religion, not what is true so much as what is agreeable. Had Ahab said, "I hate Micaiah, for he does not prophesy what is true concerning me"—that, however mistaken an assertion, would have been intelligible. Ahab may remind us of the conduct of people of whom we very probably have heard, who, having some organic disease in their constitutions, shrewdly suspect what is the matter with them, and send for a first-class physician; and when he gently intimates to them that they are right in their conjecture, they become violently angry with him; and when he adds that their only chance of delaying their fate lies in their adopting a certain line of treatment, they do so to their own advantage, and yet dismiss the physician who has prescribed it. Certainly eastern despots have no monopoly of irrational conduct of this description. Democracies may be capable of just the same thing, and history shows that Greek republics could be as cruel and unreasonable as tyrants. It was not Pilate, but the multitude that cried "Crucify Him." It was a Christian Church which an Apostle had to ask, "Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" Ahab did not hesitate to say that he hated the prophetic message because it bore hardly upon himself. Many an objector to Christianity in our day would say "I dislike Christianity because, if it is true, it does not prophesy good concerning me, but evil. It makes such serious demands, it proposes so high a standard, it implies that so much of what I say and do is a great mistake, that I must away with it, it does violence to my inclinations and passions." This, before his conversion, was the case with the great Augustine, that servant of Christ whose name occurs in the Calendar of our Prayer Book for this very day. St. Augustine tells us how completely he was enchained by his passions, and how he had become intellectually satisfied of the truth of the Church of Christ, but was held back from conversion by the fear that he would have to give up so much. In the end we know, through God's grace, he broke his chains, those chains which held poor Ahab captive. Men treat what is only a warp of the will as a difficulty of the understanding, while the real culprit is almost always the will. The will sees Revelation advancing to claim the allegiance of the soul. It sees that to admit this claim will oblige it to do much that is distasteful, and so it makes an effort to clog, to hinder the direct action of the understanding. Its public language is, "I cannot accept religion, because it makes this or that assertion which, to my mind, is open to objection;" but if it saw deeper into itself it would say: "I dislike this creed, for it doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil, while I continue to live as I do."

And is not this devotion to the agreeable at the cost of the truth to be found among Christians? Are there not portions of revealed truth which some of us shrink from or dislike because they condemn us as we are? Have we never heard of certain chapters of the Bible being unread even by believers in the Bible, professedly because they are thought difficult to reconcile with other chapters which are assumed to contain the essence of the Gospel but really because they put before us those sterner and more awful sides of truth which that which is lowest and weakest in our characters would have us forget. In like manner, particular Christian doctrines are rejected, not really on the ground of deficient warrant, but because they are unwelcome to flesh and blood. Who does not see how easily this might happen in respect of the doctrine of the Atonement, that overwhelming representation of the Love of God in the Divine Redeemer, which, if it be sincerely believed, cannot but demand complete self-surrender? Or again the great and awful doctrines of Grace or of the Sacraments, which are the ordinary channels of Grace; or the revelations of the world beyond the grave, the revealed destiny of the saved, the revealed destiny of the lost; who does not see how easily we may turn from these, because, for the moment, we have too many reasons for doing so. May God of His mercy give us minds open to all the rays of His blessed truth, and good wills to obey it and to act on it, whatever it may be, that so by His holy inspiration we may think those things that be good, and by His merciful guidance may perform the same.

THE VALUE OF PATIENT WORK.

By the Rev. EDWARD A. W. SEYMOUR, M.A.,
Curate of Amington, Tamworth.

A Harvest Sermon Preached at St. Saviour's, Denmark Park, on Michaelmas Day, 1887.

"In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand: for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good."—Eccles. xi. 6.

"Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days."—Eccles. xi. 1.

THE heat and burden of the day are over; the garners are full; the harvest has been gathered in; and the earth, after good work done, is preparing for the long rest of winter. We too, in sympathy with outward nature, are invited on this evening of thanksgiving to take a brief period of rest and refreshment. We may, as it were, stand aside from our own lives and see them as a whole; we may cast off the burden of their petty details and catch the grand drift of them as it exists in God's purpose; and in so doing take heart for the future. The lives of most of us are monotonous and uneventful; we are like the man at the wheel, who takes his orders from the captain, but sees not for himself the direction in which the ship is going; there are times no doubt when there arises a misgiving in our hearts that there is something wrong, that there are rocks ahead, and that the good ship is hurrying to destruction. To-night we are bidden for a few moments to join the Captain upon the bridge, to listen to his reassuring words, to look away into eternity behind, around us, and before, and to know that all is well. The memory of this personal communion with the Captain, who is guiding us safely through the perplexities and dangers and sorrows of life, will be a solace to us when we are once more too deeply engrossed in life's battle clearly to hear His voice. To-night we rest, but to-morrow we must be up again and working. The earth does not enter upon her winter sleep until the ground has been prepared, the grain sown and left to germinate beneath the surface, ready to shoot up at the first approach of spring; and we must not expect, "after life's fitful fever," to sleep well until we have used the faculties of mind and soul and body which God has given us, and set in motion all agencies for good we can. "In the morning," when the sun cometh forth from his chamber rejoicing as a giant to run his course, and when all is bright and hopeful around, "sow thy seed;" "and in the evening," when darkness is closing in, "withhold not thine hand," but rather redouble your efforts, because the night cometh in which no man can work. And try not to be influenced by the "winds" of feeling, nor the unaccountable "clouds" of depression which sometimes settle on the heart, remembering the words of the Italian patriot, Mazzini[*]:—"Never . . . have I allowed myself to think that my own unhappiness could in any way influence my actions. Whether the sun shine with the serene splendour of an Italian morn, or the leaden, corpse-like hue of the northern mist be above us, I cannot see that it changes our duty." Remember, if we are down-hearted and ready to give up the struggle in despair, we injure not only ourselves but others. If *we* despair, the weak, timid souls who look to us will doubt the goodness and the justice of the Creator; for great is the force of silent example. It is a tonic to see the workman day by day setting out to ply his daily tasks; to hear the trains speeding along their iron tracks, to know that the corn is silently and patiently growing in the fields; to realise that in spite of the emotions and perplexities and fears of our trembling hearts, the stars continue rolling in their eternal course. All concurs in pressing home upon us that the great Father has a glorious purpose for His children; and it is our weakness that sometimes prevents our being conscious of it. In ancient times, when Rome had lived through a period of trial and disaster, she could attribute no higher praise to her leaders than to affirm of them that they, while others fell away, "had not despaired of the republic"!

We must sow without expecting immediate results, or, necessarily, any results at all which we can touch and see. The world's "coarse thumb and finger" estimates us by the work we have to show. God takes us for what we are. In God's eyes—[†]

All instincts immature,
All purposes unsure,
That weighed not as his work, yet swelled the man's amount;
All I could never be,
All men ignored in me,
This I was worth to God.

In the old Scandinavian[‡] story, the mighty hero

---

[*] From "Essay on Mazzini," Myers.

[†] From "Rabbi Ben Ezra," Robert Browning.

[‡] See Carlyle "On Heroes." "The Hero as Divinity."

Thor thought he had not so much as disturbed the giant's rest, when in the night he dealt him three furious blows as he lay stretched, in his unwieldy bulk, along the plain. But next morning the ground that had been smooth and level was furrowed with three deep valleys, the result of those seemingly fruitless strokes. "Thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good." In God's eyes we may be doing a real work, when to ourselves we seem utterly useless. As we look back over our past lives, who are the people who have influenced us for ever? Not those who in the spirit of proselytism startled us with a sudden shock and thought by the pressure of the moment to change the drift of a life. Not these, but rather those who did not strive to exert an undue personal influence over us, but who set us a silent example of manly patience and fortitude. Those who trusted us and thought well of us, and who tried to draw out what there was of worth within us. "Cast thy bread upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days." If there is one lesson which harvest-time seems to point to more than another, it is God's quiet, calm, unobtrusive, patient, and persistent way of working. The length of time that must elapse before His purposes are accomplished presents no difficulty to Him, for in His eyes 1,000 years are as one day, and one day as 1,000 years. But it is perhaps misleading to speak of time at all in reference to God. To Him there is no past and no future, but one eternal present. God is ever the all-pervading "I am." We live in an age of loud movements and excitement. Any movement which makes a noise and partakes of the character of the marvellous is sure of a hearing, and very natural it is that so it should be, for it feeds men's coarser instincts. Meanwhile the "still small voice" which makes its appeal to the higher, purer sensibilities, is lost amid the general hubbub. In keeping with this temper of mind, people are apt to think it most honouring to God to suppose He completed the earth in a moment of time, and amidst a vast upheaval of nature. We now know that age after age elapsed, and the Great Workman's hand is still upon His work to mould it. The same laws are now at work as were God's servants in the beginning. At times He displays His strength in deluges and earthquakes, but generally He works in quiet ways. At this moment, though so slowly and gradually that we perceive it not, the rains are grinding down the hills and carrying them to the sea, thus "sowing the dust of continents that are to be."* Land and water are as surely changing places as when God said, "Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear." But the forces which are bringing about this marvellous change will not reap their final effect until "after many days." It is thus that God works in the soul of man. Sometimes He seems to work a sudden change amid the storms and whirlwinds of conscience, but generally He influences it in quiet, gradual, simple ways. If He spent ages of time in making the world, shall He grudge the pains He bestows upon a human character which is to be gradually conformed to His own image? You cannot force men into God's service in a moment, and under the stress of fear; you can only win them to it gradually by the quiet demonstration of its loveableness. We may fairly test the metal of which we are made by putting to ourselves the questions: Are we looking for results which may be had immediately and without much trouble? or are we honestly working, with the devotion and concentration of our lives, towards a distant object, which can only be reached, if reached at all, "after many days"? The man who has so little grasp upon the true riches of life that he cares only to gratify his bodily senses, may do so at once. The objects of his pleasure lie ready to hand, and he has his reward. But he has missed the true end of his being, and he has to pay for his indulgence afterwards in the undermining of his constitution, in the decay of his mental power, and in the fruitless aching of remorse. In proportion to the nobility of our quest must be the demands it makes of us, and the interval of time that must elapse before we have the fruition of it. The man of science devotes himself to the cause of truth. He cares not for the applause of the multitude. Perhaps he has few friends, but little he recks of it, for the great spirits of "those who know"* in all ages are with him, peopling his quiet closet, where he spends sleepless nights and days at the expense of health and worldly success, more than content if he may but pass on the lamp of truth a few paces in the race to which he has devoted his life. The highest quest of all is God Himself. "My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God."† "O Lord, thou hast fashioned us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they rest in Thee." He gathers up in Himself more than all that art and science, religion and philosophy, are seeking after on their several tracks, for He is the whole of beauty, the whole of goodness, and the whole of truth:

> They are but broken lights of Thee,
> And Thou, O Lord, art more than they!‡

Art seeks Him on the side of the beautiful rather than on the side of duty, and let us not underrate her influence. Especially to-night may we remember that He rejoices in the beauty of the corn-field and in the vast expanse of virgin forest, with its luxuriant vegetation and its myriad forms of life, on which the eye of man has never rested, and on which the foot of man has never trod. "The whole earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof." Even in the Book, where our short-sightedness sometimes regrets that the consideration of Art and Beauty occupy so small a space, we are bidden to "consider the lilies of the field." And no one who lives in the gloomy streets of some great town, far away from all the sweet influences of the country, and who seeks for refreshment to his spirit in the contemplation of some expensive work of art, is necessarily to be blamed for his extravagance, or told that it might have been "sold for much and given to the poor."

---

* "In Memoriam," Tennyson, xxxv.

* "Il Maestro di color che sanno." "Inferno," Dante, Canto iv. 131.

† "Fecisti nos ad te, Domine, et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in te."—St. Augustine.

‡ "In Memoriam." Preface.

Remember the poor woman who was praised for breaking the costly box of spikenard, and pouring it upon Christ's head. Oh! let us not, in the spirit of Pharisaism, deny the claims of the artist and of the man of science, equally with the professed theologian, to be workers together with God, "casting their bread upon the waters," and in the Christian spirit of noble self-abnegation caring not whether they personally ever find it again or not. But they *do* find it even now. Do not we, who are not philosophers and artists, but ordinary men and women, leading, most of us, common-place humdrum lives of daily toil, do not *we* in our small way feel that not an honest effort we make, not an aspiration we lift heavenward, but an immediate return is made to us in a quiet conscience, a more hopeful spirit, a fresh insight into the unseen, an interchange of filial affection between ourselves and the great Father of our spirits, so that we esteem the reproach for Christ greater riches than the showy and superficial attractions which the world has to offer us? Let us then boldly espouse the cause that seems to fail. The harvest of the future is with us; the right must win, even though it be not until "after many days" that the final goal is reached.

There shall not be one lost good!
All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall exist:
Not its semblance but itself:—
The high that proved *too* high, the heroic for earth too hard,
The passion that left the ground to lose itself in the sky,
Are music sent up to God by the lover and the bard.
Enough that *He* heard it once, *we* shall hear it by-and-bye.*

* * *

THE Lincoln Diocesan Conference, at their recent session, on the motion of the Dean of Lincoln, seconded by Sir C. H. J. Anderson, resolved not to elect representatives to the Central Council, the conference believing that, now that the House of Laymen had been created by the action of the Primate, such a body as the Central Council was no longer necessary. But much gratitude was expressed for the work done by the Central Council in the past, and their belief that its existence had prepared the way for the more speedy creation of the House of Laymen.

RHEUMATISM, GOUT,
SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, INDIGESTION, CONSTIPATION, LIVER & KIDNEY COMPLAINTS, NERVOUS DISORDERS, LADIES' AILMENTS, ETC. Promptly Relieved and CURED BY
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT
ALL sufferers should read "Harness' Guide to Health," free by post, containing copies of Thousands of Testimonials. Every man and woman in search of Health, Strength, and Energy, should at once send a 21s. postal order to the Medical Battery Co." Ltd. 52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W. and procure one of these famous Belts, and they may rely upon being
CURED
Corner of Rathbone Place.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1887.

AMERICA AND STIPULATED ARBITRATION.

MR. WILLIAM JONES, the Secretary of the Peace Society, together with several other gentlemen, members of the Society of Friends in this country, have proceeded to the United States, for the purpose of promoting the formation of a special Treaty for Arbitration between the two nations. Another deputation is to present the address on the same subject, which has been signed by Members of Parliament. We earnestly hope that the Friends of Peace on the other side of the Atlantic will cordially co-operate with all the missionaries of Peace from this side; and that their joint efforts will succeed in securing what cannot fail to be regarded as a great conquest of civilisation.

The object of the present effort is for the conclusion of a special Arbitration Treaty between the United States and the United Kingdom. What has been generally done has been to insert an arbitration clause in Treaties about to be made, or which have been already made on other questions. There has been great and gratifying progress in this direction, especially by means of Signor Mancini. Availing himself of the fact that during his occupancy of the office of Foreign Secretary, a large number of Treaties had to be negotiated between Italy and other countries, he inserted in almost all those Treaties, amounting to eighteen or nineteen, an Arbitration clause. The idea of entering into Treaties expressly and exclusively for the purpose of Arbitration, or of giving to an Arbitration clause a wide and general scope, so as to affect all the relations of the contracting parties, is somewhat novel. So far as we know, it was first ventilated in modern times by Mr. William Jay, an able and admirable man, who, in a work published by him in New York in 1842, suggested that in the next Treaty negotiated between, say, the United States and France, it should be stipulated that if any controversy should arise between the two countries, not only in regard to the interpretation of that particular Treaty, but "in respect to any other subject, the matter in dispute shall be submitted to the arbitrament of one or more friendly powers."

---

* From "Abt Vogler." Robert Browning.

The Peace Conference Committee made a similar suggestion to Lord Clarendon in 1853. But the *first* movement in favour of an Arbitration Treaty, pure and simple, was made in a petition presented by the *Peace Society* to Parliament in 1847, which contained these words: "Your petitioners pray your honourable House to take prompt and decisive measures to secure the adoption of a Treaty of Arbitration between the British Government and the other Governments of the world respectively, in which the parties shall mutually pledge themselves to refer every disputed question which cannot be settled by friendly negotiation to such impartial arbitrators, and to abide by the decision thus given, without having any recourse to arms."

In the following year, 1848, the subject was considered at the Peace Congress, held at Brussels, when a letter from Mr. Cobden was read, in which he expressed his cordial approval of the proposal that Treaties should be entered into for the express purpose of binding the contracting parties to submit their future quarrels to the decision of arbitrators. "I do not think," he says, "it would be easy to find an object more worthy of a separate Treaty."

A few months later, Mr. Cobden brought before the House of Commons a Motion for an Address to the Crown, praying that the Secretary for Foreign Affairs might be directed to invite foreign Powers to concur in Treaties having precisely this object.

About six years ago Mr. Richard, M.P., suggested to several influential American correspondents that circumstances then appeared to be opportune for an effort to obtain a Treaty between Great Britain and the United States, agreeing to refer to Arbitration any future differences which might arise between them. American statesmen being less fettered by old traditions of European diplomacy, were, it was thought, more free to attempt such an innovation than ours. The responses to this overture were most friendly and encouraging, and efforts have been made, in different ways, to give effect to the suggestion.

* * *

THURSDAY, October 13th, being the anniversary of the translation of Edward the Confessor, a pilgrimage was made to his shrine in Westminster Abbey.

WORDS OF A BELIEVER.

I AM a Christian believer. I was brought up in Christianity, and have continued in it through a life which now has not been short. By Christianity I mean the doctrines taught by Christ and His Apostles, the most characteristic of which are formulised in the Nicene Creed. These are the doctrines known as the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement or Reconciliation.*

The doctrine of the Trinity is the basis of that of the Incarnation. In this brief summary of my position I cannot speak further of it.

The Incarnation and the Atonement are not two doctrines, but one doctrine viewed in two ways. The divine Son of God, eternal not only in the future but from the past, was united with a human nature in the person of Jesus Christ, and in that person fought against and defeated the powers of evil, though suffering in the conflict. This, viewed in itself, is called the Incarnation. Viewed in its results, it is called the Atonement.

I confess that I have never yet quite got over the strangeness of this. Reason, however—by which I mean not any special faculty, but the mind acting deliberately—teaches me that what is strange is the existence of evil; and that it ought not to seem incredible if what appear to be strange means have been put in force to overcome and destroy evil. Nor do I see any moral objection to the doctrine that the sufferings of Christ were a necessary part of His work. No one can explain why they were so. The explanation that they "satisfied Divine Justice" as being the punishment due to the sins of the guilty, after which the guilty could be treated as innocent, is a mere invention of man, rationalising without being rational. But I have no difficulty in accepting the teaching of Christ and of His Prophets and Apostles that there was some necessity in the nature of things for His sufferings; and any moral objection to this doctrine is sufficiently answered by the fact that they were voluntary.

But though we are no judges of the necessity for the Incarnation and the Atonement, we are quite able to understand the effect it ought to have upon us to believe that the highest of all examples and the greatest of all teachers is not only a historical character, to whom we owe the same kind of gratitude which we owe to other great and good men of the past, but is also our Saviour, our Judge, and our God. Faith in Him comes from "What we have the likest God within the soul." This is what I regard as Christianity viewed on its theological side;—if in this short paper I say nothing about the moral teaching of Christ, it is because I take it for granted;—and no Unitarian compromise between the Christianity of the Nicene Creed, and the religion of mere common sense, seems to me to have the slightest plausibility.

But in many ways the creed in which I was brought up has undergone a change.

I no longer believe in any dogma of original sin. I have no doubt that the story of the Fall in the Book of Genesis is an allegory, but were it proved to be historical it still would leave the difficulty of the existence of evil altogether untouched. I recognise the fact that sin is universal in the human race, but this is not a theological dogma.

---

* See the Epistle to the Romans v. 11, revised version.

Nor do I believe—I never did—in any dogma of election; but I see, as a matter of fact, that the Providential way of effecting progress and improvement is not by acting on entire species together, but by the agency of "favoured races"* and individuals. This is proved by all nature and all history.

Nor do I believe in any dogma of justification by faith; but I see that Christ's way of making men better is not to begin with teaching external actions, however right, but by purifying the heart; and that His way of purifying the heart is by means of faith in Himself,† producing likeness to His character.

I have also ceased to believe in any miraculous freedom of the Holy Scriptures from error. I am convinced on scientific grounds that there is nothing in the Bibical narrative before Abraham, which can be relied on as historical; and, consequently, that no objection from the letter of Scripture can be permitted to stand in the way of scientific research or speculation concerning the origin of the world, of the organic creation, and of man. And I am convinced, on rational and spiritual grounds, that even when treating of spiritual matters, all parts of the Scriptures are not of equal value. Such a saying as Solomon's, "The Lord hath made all things for Himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil,"‡ a saying which might be in the Koran, ought not to be quoted as if it were of the same weight with Saint John's twice-repeated§ "God is love," which none could have said except one whom the Spirit of Christ had taught. A mechanical handling of Scripture, as if all parts of it were of equal value and we were never to venture beyond its letter, is condemned in Scripture itself. Saint Paul says, that "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life."‖ I do not know how much this means, but it means at least that the understanding and the spirit are more important for the interpretation of Scripture than mere grammar and logic. And Christ told the Sadducees that they "Greatly erred, not knowing the Scriptures, neither the power of God," because they did not find the doctrine of the resurrection and immortality, in a passage of the Old Testament which does not expressly mention it.¶

I have also ceased to believe in the hopelessness of the future state. I could not believe in Christ if He really taught that God will condemn men to endless torments for sins which they could not have avoided, even though they are partly their own fault. But Christ does not teach this; the word eternal does not necessarily mean more than agelong; and I do not think it is possible for any competent person, with his attention properly directed to the subject and his mind unprejudiced, to read the Epistles of Saint Paul, without perceiving that the Apostle teaches us to expect a time when Christ shall have "abolished all enemies,"** extinguishing all sin, and with it all suffering.

The foregoing is a statement of my belief. I do not say that it is free from difficulties, but the difficulties of unbelief are much greater. As for historical difficulties, a life-long familiarity with the Gospels, constantly I trust growing more intelligent, convinces me that their narrative is historical. I am satisfied of this not only on theological but on critical grounds; and I am fully convinced of the insufficiency and falsehood of the theory that Christ's miracles are fictions, invented, whether consciously or unconsciously, after His death by His disciples, from the idea that so great and good a man must have wrought miracles. Neither has what is called the scientific objection to miracles any weight with me. It is not possible that science can disprove miracles. It is not possible that any amount or degree of knowledge respecting gravitation, electricity, and the rest of the forces of nature can ever disprove the fundamental doctrine of religion, namely, that there is a power behind nature, usually hidden, but which may on occasion be revealed. And if we believe that the Eternal Son of God came into the world to bring deliverance from sin, it is to be expected that His coming should be attended with "signs and wonders."

But though my judgment is satisfied with the proofs of Christianity, yet, as Pascal remarked, it is scarcely possible to keep a mass of proof constantly before the mind; and when I feel inclined to doubt, the consideration is conclusive with me, that unless Christianity as taught by Christ and His Apostle Saint Paul is true, the character, teaching, and life of Christ are without significance, and without meaning; and this is impossible.

M.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE KEYS AS EMBLEMS OF ST. PETER.

SIR,—It has interested me much to try and find out the reason for St. Peter being represented with two keys. No one has given me a reasonable answer to my question on the subject. I will give in short, and in order of terms, the answers obtained most commonly. 1st. To represent the keys of Heaven and Hell. 2nd. For binding and loosing. 3rd. (Four answered.) An unpractical question. 4th. A few—cannot tell. 5th. One very kindly entered upon the subject, and brought quotations from St. Chrysostom and others against me.

I had an opportunity of consulting Romanists both directly and indirectly, and they ought to know certainly all about St. Peter, but all showed themselves as learned as myself and my friends; indeed, one, a bishop, by politeness perhaps, agreed with me, confirming, in another way, my theory that "three" should be the number of keys; viz.: "The two keys given by the Father and the Son—before the Ascension—would be of no value till after the day of Pentecost, when the gift would be confirmed by the Holy Ghost giving the third key." The reason for the three keys was complete.

I remember a story told of the late Dr. Whewell who had in early life written an article on "the structure of the Chinese language"; having proved himself a most learned man, the Fellows of Trinity, wishing to find him at fault, introduced the subject of the Chinese language, and laid down the rule from the before-named article. "No, gentlemen," said the doctor, "it is quite wrong, and I wrote the Article in question, and nothing can be more full of error, as I have found upon further inquiry."

---

* This expression is Darwin's. The full title of his great work is "The Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life."

† See Acts xv. 9.

‡ Proverbs xvi. 4.

§ 1st Epistle of John, iv. 8, 16.

‖ 2 Corinthians iii. 6.

¶ Matt. xxii., Mark xii., Luke xx.

** 1 Corinthians xv. 22, 28.

And thus I think of my paper on the keys, owing to a friend, whom I met only a few days ago, and by whom I was put in the way of finding that Tertullian has discussed fully on the subject of St. Peter's privileges, and has given a reasonable reason for two keys, since to St. Peter was given the high honour and glory of being the first to unlock the gates of Heaven to the Jew first, and then to the Gentile, Acts ii. 14-41, and x. 34-48. So that now I am quite satisfied this is the true reason why two keys should be the emblems of St. Peter.

C. J. WILDING.

Arley, October 6th, 1887.

◆

THE PREFACE TO THE IRISH PRAYER BOOK.

SIR,—To prevent the possibility of any of your readers being caused to believe the slander of your correspondent against the authors of the Preface of the Church of Ireland Prayer-book, will you permit me to make the following observation :—The question is, does the concluding statement of the second paragraph of that Preface contain an absolute falsehood, as your correspondent says, or does it contain a statement of perfect truth, as I say it does?

What passed in debate in the Synod, and what is said in the Revision Report, cannot make a true statement in the Preface false. To introduce this irrelevant matter is the metaphorical red-herring. The new question and answer in the Catechism were recommended in the Report, and this recommendation was debated in the Synod; which recommendation and which debate have nothing to do with the statement in the Preface describing the change in the catechism that was made.

The Report describes this change, in the words quoted by your correspondent, thus: "That the following question and answer, taken from the 28th Article, should be added." The Preface describes the change, "One question, with an answer taken out of the twenty-eighth of the said Articles." That is, according to the description in the Report the phrase *taken from* applies to both question and answer; and according to the description in the Preface, *taken out of* applies to the answer only. Your correspondent contends that *taken out of* in the Preface, applies to both question and answer; and brings the very fact of the differences of wording and of punctuation as proof that the same thing is meant. In his former letter (that in PULPIT of 24th ult.), he falsified a quotation from the Preface by interpolating a comma that is not in the original; in his letter in to-day's PULPIT he pretends to despise commas.

There was a discussion in the Synod, I do not remember on what resolution, when the matter arose of the use of a comma. Some one whose knowledge of English composition was about equal to that of your correspondent, said that it did not signify; upon this one of the authors of the Preface replied, that a comma sometimes does signify, because a comma, used before "By whom all things were made," in the Nicene creed, alters the meaning, and contradicts the Gospel of St. John.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

October 8th, 1887.

EUCHARISTIC ADORATION.

SIR,—We seem to me to be on ground that requires careful walking, if we propose to connect our worship with any material object. Our justification for so connecting it ought to be particularly clear, and I wish to ask a question, old enough I daresay, which seems to require a very clear answer, before we are justified in accepting the doctrine or practice of Eucharistic Adoration. The question is this: How can we know that "This is my Body" is to be understood more literally than "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life"? On any supposition the sacrilegious partaking of the Holy Communion does not convey eternal life, and therefore I submit that neither passage is to be taken literally.

May I also ask a question I have asked before in your columns, viz., Why we should practise Eucharistic Adoration and not Baptismal Adoration, if the newly baptised infant be a member of Christ?

ERIGENA.

◆

HE WHO CATECHISES FORMS THE MIND OF YOUTH.

SIR,—The Catechism is now laid on the dissecting table with you, as it lately was with us in Ireland.

1. *Here*, with us, the object was to get rid of priest and bread, as necessary in order to the due reception of the grace of the Eucharist. It was attempted to make faith the only mean, to the exclusion of any on God's part. How far our Puritans have succeeded our new question and answer can speak for themselves.

2. With *you* the attempt will be made in the ritualistic direction. Indeed the bread will also be got rid of; but for a very different reason. A High Church organ teaches that bread vanishes, leaving only its appearances. Now, in the way of this position, stand the words of the Catechism, "Our bodies are strengthened and refreshed by the bread and wine." But how can our bodies be strengthened and refreshed by mere appearances? Can a man be fed by a mere picture of food? Then, as our souls are said to be strengthened and refreshed *only in the same manner* as our bodies are, the benefit to our souls vanishes like that to our bodies. This answer should be thus altered, "our souls are strengthened and refreshed as our bodies would be, by the bread and wine, if their substance remained."

3. The definition of a sacrament will also have to be altered; "An outward and visible sign, as a mean whereby we receive the grace." But how can a mere appearance be a means? The *Church Times* said, some time since, that mere appearances were a sufficient second part of a sacrament. But this is a violent interpretation, the necessity of which must be removed.

This answer must be thus altered, "An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, as an appearance, clothing the substance of the gift," etc.

4. There is another blot in the Church Catechism. "Bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received." But how stands this with the new Popish dogma, that of bread and wine, there remains only the appearances? Did our Lord command only the shadows to be received? This answer must also

be changed, "Bread and wine, the appearances of which the Lord hath commanded to be received"

5. Lately a ritualistic dignitary of Dublin diocese is reported to have told an assembly of our clergy that his party can make nothing of the Catechism. He might well say so! Thus we stand. The Catechism is to be explained away, in order that tridentine divinity may be taught to our children.

6. Take warning by our performances. We have got rid of priest and bread. With you it will be attempted only to get rid of bread.

7. A further difficulty here occurs to me. How can our souls be strengthened and refreshed by a solid material body, remembering our Lord's words, "The flesh profiteth nothing"? This difficulty we do not feel; for "It is the spirit that quickeneth," according to our theory that, by His Body He meant a grace or spirit coming from His Body. So says Bishop Cosin, "Christ from Heaven reacheth down to us the divine virtue of His flesh," an idea which is now sneered at as "Virtualism." Though our tridentine surgeons were able to deprive the Catechism of all virtue, their work would still remain only half done. All is nothing, so long as the service is allowed to call the consecrated elements "these Thy creatures"; and so long as the Black Rubric and the two Articles assert that our Lord's Body retains all that appertains to the perfection of man's nature, "being bound," as one of our Irish numskulls most irreverently said, "by the limits that condition a material clod," so long as these remain, all nibbling at the Catechism is useless. As we told our Puritans here, so you may tell the Ritualists with you, the thing must be a root and branch business. No tinkering and patching will do. The whole thing must be pulled down and built up again *de novo*. At present the Catholic assertion of truth and the Protestant denial of error, are entwined in the very vitals of the Church. You must either leave it so, or, if you destroy the equilibrium, make it either wholly Puritan or wholly Papistical. There is no other alternative. Push it to one side or push it to the other, down its own weight will carry it. It cannot stand unless you allow it to remain evenly balanced, as it now is.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

Reviews and Notices.

"ELIJAH: HIS LIFE AND TIMES." By Rev. Prof. W. Milligan, D.D. London: James Nisbet & Co. 1887. Price 2s. 6d.

UNDER the title of "Men of the Bible," an interesting series of small books is being written by various very able writers. The particular one to which we wish to call attention is that on Elijah. The life of this wonderful prophet is described by Prof. Milligan in a most interesting way, and the explanation he offers of passages which occur in the Bible in connection with the history of Elijah are deserving of much thought; they throw light on expressions which are very difficult of comprehension to the general reader of Scripture. Take, for instance, the "chariot of fire and the horses of fire," which we are told in 2 Kings ii. 11, appeared when Elijah was translated to heaven. Prof. Milligan shows us very clearly how the horses and chariots of fire were, as on a later occasion in the life of Elisha, an appearance sent to reveal to him the protecting power of the Almighty towards his people. In reference to Elisha's cry, "My father, my father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof," he says: "Chariots and horsemen were then the bulwarks of a nation in its times of war. They were that arm of its military force on which it placed most reliance, and of which its enemies were most afraid. 'Some,' says the Psalmist, 'trust in chariots and some in horses'" (Ps. xx. 7). Such a bulwark of truth, such a defence to the faithful among whom he lived, such a terror to the faithless had Elijah been. His whole life is summed up by his disciple in that parting cry with which he followed him on his path to heaven. We would also call special attention to the closing part of the second chapter, where Prof. Milligan describes Elijah being sent to Zarephath, and the lessons which God taught him by it; and also to some beautiful thoughts on the subject of prayer in the fourth chapter. In speaking of those who, unable to see how prayer can alter the eternal laws by which God rules the world, rest their defence of prayer only upon its reflex influence, he says: "Let us acknowledge the value of the reflex influence thus spoken of, but what is it that it really springs from? Is it not most of all from this, that, in prayer we approach One who will consider our wants with infinite love and wisdom, and who will judge for us better than we can ourselves. In order to the reflex good it is obviously necessary that the process through which we pass to the obtaining of it shall be genuine, shall be at least real and true. But there is no reality or truth in asking what we know beforehand can neither be granted nor obtained, or what, if it is to come will come whether we ask or not." This book will certainly be found helpful to Bible readers.

THE following is Professor Hort's address to the electors to the Lady Margaret's Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge:—

"From my first entrance at the University I have been a student of theology, and it has been the chief object of my study from the time when I became a Master of Arts. For fifteen years I had the charge of a country parish, and for above fifteen years more I have been residing at Cambridge and lecturing on theological subjects, chiefly on the Apostolic Epistles and on selected writings of the Fathers. In any future work which I may be permitted to carry on here, either as a student or as an instructor and helper of younger students, it would be my desire, as before, to be mainly occupied with the interpretation and elucidation of the Bible, in constant reference to its theological teaching, and with the history of the Church, for the earlier centuries in particular, giving special attention to the history of doctrine and institutions. The experience of the nine years during which I have occupied the Hulsean chair has given me a yet deeper sense than before of the responsibilities of a Cambridge Professor of Divinity, responsibilities at once enlarged and lightened by the zeal of life and earnestness of inquiry which are happily increasing on every side. It is therefore not without misgivings that I have now decided to offer myself for a post which with the higher vantage-ground conferred by its illustrious traditions would bring some increase of these responsibilities. I can but say that if the electors' choice should fall on me, I shall welcome their confidence as a fresh incentive to serve the University and the Church with unstinted devotion."

THE Young Men's Friendly Society, which was established in 1879, has now more than 370 branches in England, Scotland, and the colonies, upwards of 20,000 members and associates, and above fifty affiliated institutions. It is rapidly increasing. Its objects are to promote purity, temperance, and general morality; to befriend young men leaving home or moving from one place to another, and protecting them from evil influences; to promote thrift and independence, especially by encouraging young men to make provision against sickness, accident, and want, on sound principles; to promote a healthy tone of literature and amusement among young men, and to promote co-operation amongst institutions existing for kindred objects. The general secretary Mr. W. R. Arbuthnot, Northumberland Chambers, Charing Cross, W.C.

AT the annual festival of the Leeds Clergy School a fair number of old students were present to meet the Dean of Worcester, and to say farewell to Canon Worlledge on his leaving for Truro. After a celebration at the parish church matins was said at the grammar-school chapel, and a sermon was preached by Canon Mason, Vicar of All Hallows', Barking, who took for his text 2 Cor. xi. 3. At the luncheon which followed, the Vicar, as Warden of the Clergy School, spoke of the thoroughness of Canon Worlledge's work at Leeds, and the deep regret which all alike felt at his departure. Canon Worlledge, in thanking his former students for a testimonial given to the college in memory of his work there, referred to the present satisfactory state of the Clergy School and the bright prospects for the future after the somewhat trying changes through which it had passed. He added that the numbers would be full when the Rev. G. H. Fowler succeeded him as principal in the coming term. Dean Gott reminded his old students of the pressing need of catechising and care for the younger members of the flock.

ON Sunday the 9th inst., the Bishop of Bedford, in preaching at St. Pancras before the Railway Temperance Union, said that at the Church Congress, from which he had just returned, one of the saddest things that was heard was the way in which Englishmen—soldiers, sailors, and settlers—were hindering the cause of Christ by this sin of drunkenness in foreign lands. If the natives whom we sought to win for Christ saw those who professed to live according to the Gospel of Christ giving way to intemperance, were they not likely to stumble? In some parts of the world Mahommedanism itself was winning more converts than Christianity, just because its fruits seemed to the people to be better and purer. It made people at all events sober, and they not unnaturally said, "Here is Christianity, which makes people drunkards!" This was a great disgrace to our name as a Christian country. His lordship went on to warn his hearers against the worse than folly of denouncing the use of wine in the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Were he to do so, he would dread lest he had offended the Lord, for though he allowed that it was an open question what sort of wine was used at the Lord's Supper, and although it seemed a doubtful question whether the wine was mixed with water, there was nothing to show that the Lord used unfermented wine. Apart from that great consideration, he would consider himself exceedingly presumptuous if he ventured to condemn what had been the universal practice of the Church of Christ.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barber, Rev. Henry, M.D., L.R.C.P.L., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Ely.
Baylis, Rev. F., M.A., Vice-Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford; Rector of St. Philip's, Bradford-road, Manchester.
Bromwich, Rev. Crowder Tom, Rector and Vicar of Gestingthorpe.
Casey, Rev. Edmond, Rector of Ashley-with-Silverley, Cambridgeshire.
Grey, Rev. Frederick Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Wendens Ambo, Essex.
Hemstock, Rev. H., Vicar of Deeping St. Nicholas; Vicar of Bradshaw, Yorkshire.
Holmes, Rev. William Perowne, M.A., Vicar of Longthorpe, Northamptonshire.
Jackson, Rev. William Edward, M.A., Vicar of Stotford, Beds.
Lewthwaite, Rev. T., Vicar of Newsome; Vicar of All Souls', Halifax.
Miller, Rev. Augustus Jameson, M.A., Rector of Wootton, Northamptonshire.
Noyes, Rev. W. C., Government Chaplain Bengal Ecclesiastical Establishment; Archdeacon of Rangoon.
Robertson, Rev. Divie, Prebendary of Firle in Chichester Cathedral.
Sharpe, Rev. Alfred Bowyer, M.A., Minister; Vicar of St. Agnes's, Exning, Suffolk.
Shaw, Rev. Glencairn Alexander, M.A., Vicar of Mackworth, Derbyshire.
Smith, Rev. Joseph Manners, B.A., Rector of Barnardiston, Suffolk.
Stable, Rev. S. Montague, Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of Thornton-in-Lonsdale, Carnforth.
Stebbing, Rev. Frank George, Vicar of Featherstone, York.
Stephenson, Rev. Henry Major, M.A., Master of St. Peter's School, York; Vicar of Bourn, Cambridgeshire.
Swan, Rev. Robert, Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Peterborough.
Taylor, Rev. Arthur William, B.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Peter's, Farnworth, Lancashire.
Warwick, Rev. Arthur J., Curate of St. John's, Worcester; Vicar of Thornton-in-Lonsdale.
Wayet, Rev. Frank Field, Curate of Bishopstone, Salisbury; Vicar of East Pinchbeck, Spalding.
Woodcock, Rev. Parry John, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Paul's, Chester.

◆

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barlow, Rev. George Hilaro Philip, Vicar of Lyme Regis and Rural Dean, at the Vicarage, on the 11th inst.
Bayley, Rev. John Arden, late Chaplain H. M. Forces, only son of the Rev. A. Bayley, Rector of Edgcott Northamptonshire, at Ramsgate, on the 16th inst., aged 60.
Chamberlayne, Rev. Edward Tomes, late Rector of Witherley, at Albert-gate-mansions, Knightsbridge, on the 12th inst.
Cooke, Rev. Robert Bryan, formerly Rector of Wheldrake and Canon of York, at Bryn Alyn, Mold, on the 16th inst., aged 87.
Cox, Rev. Thomas, late Rector of Ideford, and formerly Rector of Norton-juxta-Twycross, at 2, Leagrove-road, Clevedon, on the 9th inst.
Greene, Rev. Thomas Huntley, at Middle Claydon Rectory, on the 10th inst., aged 63.
Mould, Rev. Francis T., M.A., at Depden Rectory, Bury St. Edmund's, suddenly, on the 6th inst., aged 34.
Pigot, Rev. Frederick, Curate of Knowsley, eldest son of the Rev. O. F. Pigot, Chaplain of H.M. Prison, Kirkdale, at May Pole Farm, Knowsley, Lancashire, on the 5th inst., aged 30.
Sells, Rev. Henry, A.C.S., Chaplain of Baghalpore, son of the late E. P. Sells, of Ferring, Sussex, at Baghalpore, Bengal, India, after a few days' illness, on Aug. 31st, aged 59.
Smith, Rev. James Hamblin, M.A., of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, and a Minor Canon of Rochester Cathedral, eldest son of James Hamblin Smith, of 42, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, at Woodbridge, Suffolk, on the 2nd inst. aged 29.

The Church of England Pulpit.

GOD'S BANISHED.

A SERMON BY THE REV. AUGUSTUS W. GURNEY, RECTOR OF LITTLE HEREFORD, TENBURY.

PREACHED AT LITTLE HEREFORD ON SUNDAY, 25TH SEPTEMBER, 1887.

PREFATORY NOTE, BEING AN EXTRACT FROM A LETTER OF THE REV. ARCHER GURNEY TO ONE WHO BELIEVED GOD'S BANISHED TO BE EXPELLED FOR EVER FROM THE DIVINE PRESENCE.

"OH, what a melancholy, what an unspeakably awful creed is yours! Pardon me, but I know of no heathen mythology that makes of God what Calvinistic faith does, an Almighty Fiend, who brings His wretched creatures into existence, foreseeing and foresealing their endless misery and infinite despair, and yet was free to create or not to create! Why, all the raptures of countless myriad myriads of glorified souls would be *far* too dearly purchased by the endless misery of one immortal spirit! Indeed, the frightful wickedness of this conception has driven modern Puritans to take refuge in the notion of annihilation for all but their elect selves, which is certainly a less odious doctrine than that which makes God to be the Author of never-ending evil. Why, do you not see as plain matter-of-fact that Christianity can never be defended, never be maintained, on such grounds as these? All the nobler instincts of the soul cry out against it. I, for my own part, would rather be an infidel ten thousand times over, or an agnostic, than believe in a God who should calmly hand over all heathendom and ninety-nine hundredths of Christendom to a state of endless despair and unalterable sin. It will not bear arguing. Nature and humanity cry aloud against such a creed as this. I would not accept salvation from such a God. And do not say we are not to judge God. We *are* to judge Him! He submits Himself clearly to our judgment. He appeals to our reason, to our conscience, to our sense of right, as a Father, not as an arbitrary despot. See St. Paul's inspired interpretation of Psalm li. 4 at Romans iii. 4: 'That Thou mightest overcome *when Thou art judged*.'

"Do you not understand that Christ intercedes for *all*, the quick and the dead; that He is the living propitiation for the sins of the whole world; that His sacred heart can never be satisfied, or the hunger of His righteous soul appeased, till He has brought the least and the last to God? Why, your Lord and Master is the Lover of sinners, the Lover of souls; and if the souls for which He died were weltering in fire throughout unnumbered ages without a hope, *He* would be—your Lord would be—the most miserable of all creatures, because He loves most! How soul-hardening is the prevalent heresy which can make good men suggest that the redeemed in heaven will derive satisfaction from the endless tortures of the damned! that natural love for father, mother, husband, wife, and child will be extinguished in pious breasts. Faugh! My soul sickens to think of such enormities. And as long as this really and horribly wicked lie is believed, Christianity is paralysed, and 'the Word of God is made of none effect,' and all the generous and high-minded and noble-hearted are repelled from the service of God and of Christ. And a base and selfish fear of an Almighty Tyrant is substituted for the free service of love of an All-righteous God and Father."

How gladly do I place the following sermon—which, when yet in the rough, had his approval—under the ægis of my brother, who, "being dead, yet speaketh."

For we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again; neither doth God respect any person: yet doth He devise means that His banished be not expelled from Him.—2 SAM. XIV. 14.

ABSALOM, after the murder of his brother Amnon, fled for his life to a distant city, where he abode for three years. But fatherly affection was strong in David, and "his soul longed (or was consumed) to go forth unto Absalom." And Joab, who favoured the young man, perceiving the state of the king's heart, fetched a wise woman from Tekoah, who by her skill should move the king to bring home his son. This woman feigned herself to be the mother of two sons, one of whom had slain the other, and she made petition that the murderer's life might be spared. The king, thinking of Absalom, readily granted her request; and hereupon the woman, seeing her opportunity, upbraided the king for showing mercy to a stranger whilst his own son remained unforgiven. She said: "The king doth speak this thing as one which is faulty, in that the king doth not fetch home again his banished." And next, rising to the height of inspiration, she spoke the words of the text: "For we must needs die, and are as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again; neither doth God respect any person: yet doth He devise means that His banished be not expelled from Him," or, "that he that is banished be not an outcast from Him." The wise woman prevailed to this extent that the guilty prince was presently recalled to Jerusalem, where, however, for another two years he was placed under arrest in his own house, and not allowed to see the king's face. But at the end of that time Absalom was restored to his father's favour, of which he proved unworthy.

Now few will question that the love of King David for his son is a type of our Heavenly Father's inextinguishable love for the most rebellious of His children. And, taking Absalom to represent a hardened and desperate class of offenders, let us see how the words of the text apply to such, more especially the concluding words—"Yet doth God devise means that His banished be not expelled from Him." They are words of infinite tenderness, and reach far. Seen under the light of truth and reason all Scripture gains a new significance and becomes an open book; so may it prove here.

And I ask, Who among the living may be accounted of as God's banished? I suppose we shall all grant, for one thing, that the heathen, in a sad and true sense, are God's banished; and there is not one among us who will not admit that they are more deserving of pity than of anger. Now, what are the means which our Heavenly Father deviseth here on earth that His banished heathen children be not expelled from Him, or be not outcasts from His presence? Alas, brethren, so far as we know, those means, though of great value, are insufficient. Our own branch of the Church of God and various other religious communities do indeed send forth bands of devoted men, whom we call Missionaries, to bring the heathen to the knowledge of God, and it is our duty to strengthen their hands; but, in spite of zeal and devotion, the fruits of their labours, though very real, are hitherto on no conquering scale, and, roughly speaking, two-thirds of mankind remain to this hour in heathen darkness.

But again I ask, Who among the living may be accounted of as God's banished? Now, not to dwell on the tens and hundreds of thousands of home heathen in our great towns, we shall not question that all Christians who have lapsed or fallen from grace into wilful and continuous sin are, in a true sense, God's banished. And, as regards these fallen Christians, what are the means which God deviseth here on earth, that His banished may not continue to be expelled or outcasts from Him? We know well, brethren, what those means are. They are noble, one and all, the awakening of the conscience by the influences of the Holy Spirit, the preaching of the Gospel, the absolving of penitents or ministry of reconciliation, the sacrament of love, and the like. It is a weighty part of the work of God's ministers to carry out those earthly means and use those appliances which God has devised, "that His banished be not expelled from Him;" another, and no less weighty part of their work being, to build men up in the faith. And unquestionably many sinners are drawn to our Heavenly Father through their loving if inadequate labours. But, as we know, there are many offenders even in a Christian land like ours who despise the means of reconciliation, or otherwise continue to rebel against them. And yet these despisers and rebels are, after all, the King's sons and daughters, with capacity for goodness in them; and the King's heart cannot but long, yea, and be consumed, to go forth to them. So that we see (and here is the point I aim at) the means which God doth devise in this life, whether for the conversion of foreign or home heathen, or again for the recalling to Him of Christians who have lapsed into sin, are frequently insufficient or unsuccessful, or both of these together, and that even to the end.

Now this being so, there forces itself upon us the following momentous consideration: Is it in this life only that God can and does devise means whereby His banished be not outcasts from Him for ever? If so, with all reverence be it said, the Almighty has not fulfilled His first parental duty towards His children, for to untold millions of them He has given no training here. Now, it is written, "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it." And shall God fail to do that which even a right-minded man attempts to do? This question needs no answer. He will do it with infinite wisdom and love, if not here, then hereafter! Were this not so, then indeed would mankind be most miserable. For in that case, the only means devised by the Creator for the recalling of His banished ones would have proved, on the whole, and allowing for very many exceptions, a singularly ghastly failure! Do but give a thought to the heathen world, like the sand upon the seashore for number, who are the sons and daughters of God by creation, for whom Christ died. If God—as many fable—had no further purpose to train or ennoble these when they had once passed behind the veil, then would these countless millions—not only the hundreds of millions of this generation, but the thousands of millions and ten thousands of millions of bygone generations—be banished from God's presence for ever and for evermore.* Possibly not one in ten thousand of our race has been brought in this life under the power of direct revelation, so that training, not probation, beyond the grave, is the general rule, not the exception, and must be so for our race.†

---

* We are apt to forget how immense is the majority outside the pale of revelation, *i.e.*, direct revelation. Take, *e.g.*, the period from creation to Christ's birth; and, so doing, the numerical majority of those who have never heard of God, or who at all events are out of covenant, is overwhelming: whilst, even within the Church's pale, a large proportion live and die in practical heathenism, and further, a large proportion die in infancy,—so needing to receive that training hereafter which in the nature of things they cannot have received here.

† "The thought that the heathen as such are under a Divine education, and are not excluded (if they have been seekers after God, and have followed after righteousness) from the blessedness of His kingdom, has become so much the dominant thought of the time in which we live, that we

What man now lives who would dare to pronounce a sentence of condemnation upon all this countless multitude, who have never known the true God, or Jesus Christ, whom He hath sent? In banishment they have lived, and in banishment they have died. And the question is, Is God at the end of His resources so far as these are concerned? Thus stands the case: not any means devised by God or man have lessened their banishment by one step while they were on earth, unless it be the partial light of conscience. As they drew their last breath they knew not God, knew not that His fatherly heart longed to go forth to them; and yet God loved them still. And can we suppose, my brethren, that death — sometimes called the sacrament of death—turned His love into hatred? Did God love His living sons and daughters, and only begin to hate them when they were dead? Did He love them with a useless and unavailing love so long as, consistently with the plans of His providence, He could not draw them to Him; and did He begin to hate them so soon as it was for the first time in His power to bring them home, so soon as it was in His power to begin that training which, through no fault of their own, they had lacked? If that could be, would not the King of kings be "as one which is faulty?" But, to say all in fewest words, "God is love." And surely, in a very deep sense, man's death is God's opportunity. And what is God's opportunity? According to too many it is to seize the ignorant soul, to plunge it into the lowest deep, and consign it to the care of devils to be everlastingly tormented.* And where this monstrous view does not prevail, men are apt to be silent, to be silent just where they ought to speak out. Yes! the mischief is done not so much by misrepresenting or denying as by ignoring what God's opportunity truly is.† But let us, my Christian brethren, hail God's opportunity for the noble thing it is. And first and foremost let us foresee in it a mighty work of training.

And to speak quite plainly. When the spirit stands before its merciful Creator, there falls off the ignorance and prejudice of a life-time.* Then comes God's opportunity. A flood of light, by Him directed, takes the place of darkness. And the soul, whether of heathen man or of faulty Christian, becomes conscious of its own unworthiness and of the Father's wonderful love. Then at last the soul perceives what before was hidden, that the King's heart is toward it. Then the Saviour's work is unfolded. Then the Holy Spirit's influence has free course. Then the soul learns through a thousand tender encouragements, or it may be through terrible and needful chastisements—for love can work by very painful means—what are God's devices in the world to come that His banished be not expelled from Him for ever.

So then, brethren, I invite you to consider a most blessed fact, not David's heart longing to go forth to guilty Absalom, but the mighty heart of the universal Father consumed with desire to go

---

scarcely recognise, for the more part, the slowness with which that victory over the traditions of mediæevalism and dark thoughts of God has been won, how those who fought for the truth which is now acknowledged by well-nigh all men have had their name cast out as evil, and borne the reproach of heresy or unbelief."—See "The Spirits in Prison," p. 161, Study vi., "The Salvation of the Heathen." By E. H. Plumptre, D.D., Dean of Wells.

And if the better disposed and more enlightened among the heathen shall receive an education in the world to come, how shall the more dark and ignorant among them be excluded from such training, since they need it first and foremost?

* "There are still, it may be feared, tens of thousands among us who hold that the whole heathen world, with all its strivings after light and good, in all its countless multitudes, with the myriads who have but breathed and died, is sentenced to an eternity of torment. 'There is none other name,' men tell us, and tell us truly, 'given among men whereby they must be saved, save only the name of Christ'; and ignorance of that name, they add, and add falsely, closes therefore for ever the gates of everlasting life."—P. 9, "The Spirits in Prison," by E. H. Plumptre, D.D., Dean of Wells. Wm. Isbister, Ludgate Hill.

† Take, *e.g.*, Butler's "Analogy," which works vast mischief daily by simply leaving out, not denying, the Divine Fatherhood. A large section of my brethren of the clergy preach Butler, *e.g.*, when they make *probation* the central point in our moral life, and not the *education* or *training* which a Father gives. Yet even Butler, as quoted by Dean Plumptre, could write (see "The Spirits in Prison," p. 179): "It cannot, I suppose, be imagined, even by the most cursory reader, that it is in any sort affirmed or implied in anything said in this chapter, that none can have the benefit of the general redemption, but such as have the advantage of being made acquainted with it in *this present life*" (Anal. ii. 5). And Dean Plumptre comments as follows: "The words which I have printed in italics are, in a careful and cautious writer like Butler, who weighs the force of every syllable, singularly suggestive of what were his unexpressed thoughts as to the opportunities for more perfect knowledge that may be given men in the life that follows this."

* "Souls, when released from the burden of the flesh, are likely to see spiritual things with a greater clearness than in the days of their life on earth."—"Clement of Alexandria" (Strom. vi. 6), quoted by Dean Plumptre.

And the Dean continues thus: "The mind of Augustine, however, was formed in a different mould from that of Clement. For him the maxim, *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, had the character of an axiom in all the rigour of its limitations, and there was no entrance into the Church save through the gate of baptism. Children who died unbaptised before actual sin might indeed, in their *limbus infantum*, receive a *mitissima damnatio*, but it was a damnation still, a privation of all the blessedness of the redeemed, with no hope of rising out of it. As for the so-called virtues of the heathen, they were but 'glittering vices,' done without faith, and therefore not acceptable, deserving God's wrath and damnation. The theology of Augustine stamped itself on the mind of the mediæval Church in western Christendom." So far the Dean.

How odious is the above! And what boundless error has arisen out of the faulty interpretation of this one text, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit—that is, unless he be baptised—he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"—the kingdom of God being wrongly assumed to be heaven itself, whereas it is no other than the Church on earth, which is Christ's kingdom. Millions untold may never enter into the one who yet shall enter into the other.

forth to His guilty children. What is the unrest of David in comparison with the unrest of the Father of all? What is the anxiety of David to reclaim his wayward son in this life compared with the anxiety of the universal Father to reclaim His wayward children throughout eternity? Early and late, amid the cares of empire, the thought of King David would be, How can I make Absalom sorry for his fault? How can I win him to be my dutiful and loving son? But the thoughts of our Heavenly Father, the Creator and Ruler of the Universe, who shall utter? This only let me say, Be sure there can be no rest in heaven[*] until sinners are made sorry for their sin, and called home. David longed for his son's amendment, and was baulked after all. Does this daunt us? Nay, for our Heavenly Father's will to have all men to be saved shall never be frustrated. He will know what to do. He will show plainly all His love.

And now it is time to name the revealed and conquering means which God, the blessed Three in One, has devised in His great love, that His banished be not expelled from Him for ever. God has not left Himself powerless to save His banished children, neither has He left their ultimate salvation in doubt. Now let me name the great and all-sufficient means which God has devised for the world's salvation. It is, need I say, the Incarnation, and the perfect obedience even unto death, of God's only Son. It is all-conquering love. It is God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. It is Christ the Lord fulfilling His own gracious promise, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me." This is the mighty leverage that God has devised, before the worlds were made, for finally restoring His banished to His Fatherly arms. He that was lifted up will continue here and hereafter to draw until all shall be drawn to Him. This makes up for the comparative weakness and too possible failure of all other means, entrusted as is their execution to feeble and fallible men. The Atonement made on Calvary is all embracing.[†] God will "gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth," "having made peace by the blood of His Cross." Heathens and faulty Christians, Jews, Mahometans, fire-worshippers, devil-worshippers,—Christ, "the ransom for all," shall take them finally to their Heavenly Father by the might of all-conquering love. And, dear brethren, this is none other than the Catholic faith from the beginning. For truly this is "the faith," and ever has been, that "the man Christ Jesus . . . . gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time" (1 Tim. ii. 6). And again, that "God is the Saviour of all men" (1 Tim. ii. 10).

But mercy shall not shut out justice. In the case of the heathen, we may reasonably conclude that the "few stripes" spoken of by our Lord may satisfy eternal justice. And the shortcomings of the Church of God shall be made good. And they who never heard of the true God, shall be led home by heavenly means of God's devising—the services of spirits in bliss and of angels being utilised it may be for their instruction.[*] And if the heathen shall be brought home at last, why not also those more ungrateful and more dearly-loved offenders, prodigal sons and daughters who have known something of a Heavenly Father's love, and then have recklessly cast it from them? The "many stripes" spoken of by our Lord may fitly await these, only not stripes without end.

Think, my brethren, of the countless Christians in name who, without being absolute castaways, live and die in more or less of banishment from their Heavenly Father. God has never ceased to yearn after their love, but they have not responded to His love, they have not so much as understood it. Well, at length, like those heathens of whom I spoke to you before—they die, and they come to stand face to face with their offended Father, and with His Son their Saviour and their Judge. Can you believe, brethren, that there is no love left for them? Can you suppose that their banishment from God, self-elected though it was, shall last for ever? No, you can never think so. Let them suffer what punishment they may—and who can tell how great and terrible it shall be—one thing is evident from the first, that the God from whom they have estranged themselves shall devise means that His banished be not expelled from Him for ever.

---

[*] The shocking selfishness of the heaven usually set forth is truly detestable. A mother, let us say, hangs over the bed of a dying son, a prodigal, to the last hour of his life, thrilled through with agony and sympathy. The son dies unrepentant, and we are asked to believe that the tender mother will, at her own death, lose all sympathy, and calmly enjoy the raptures of Paradise, while her child, the light of her eyes, is in the grip of devils for ever.

[†] It has been asked, "Is it not the fact that if we do away with the dogma of an endless hell, we remove the New Testament foundation for the sacrifice on Calvary?" In other words, are not Christ's atonement and an endless hell inextricably interwoven? Is not the first inept and meaningless without the second? If there be no endless hell, did not Christ die in vain?

I am able to supply a thoughtful answer to the first of these questions from the correspondence of a friend[‡].—

"I dare not say God could not pardon otherwise than through Calvary, for I do not know. I dare not explain all the reasons of the Atonement, for I do not know. But I deny flatly the least connection in the New Testament between atonement and an endless hell. It was not to redeem from an endless hell Christ came, but to open to men, nay, to the *Universe* (for many hints exist of this) a fount of infinite blessing, as well as to atone for sin. Not an infinite hell, but an infinite love, is the moving factor in the Atonement. Not so much escape from penalty as display of love. Not revelation of the lurid fires of the under world, but revelation of the ever-burning fire of love, *i.e.*, revelation of the Father's essence. Nor is the Atonement an isolated fact, as tacitly assumed so often; it is part rather of a process of taking man into God, so to speak, *i.e.*, of the Incarnation; it is a result of—a detail of—the Incarnation."

[*] Why may not the Church's mission go on in the other world? Millions of God's servants have passed behind the veil. Are their powers to rust just when they are brightest, and when the need for them is greatest? Surely the Church of the "first-born" will be a great missionary Church. And mission work will characterise the life beyond to a degree here unknown. The idea of the "Beatific Vision" may not be understood of a state of slumber or ecstasy, but of noble work, and indeed of work far more intense than we can do here. Thus, a third of our time here is given to sleep, and no little besides to food and other rest and solace. There, in imitation of our Lord, it shall be our food to do our Father's business.

And that we are not dreaming in saying this, gain assurance by considering the opening words of the text, "For we must needs die," when brought near to the closing words, "Yet doth God devise means that His banished be not expelled from Him." You see, brethren, death and God's means for restoring His banished are here coupled together. Hear the words again and note them well: "For we must needs die . . . . yet doth God devise means that His banished be not expelled from Him." It would be strange and pitiful if God could devise means in this life only, and were powerless to do so in the life to come. And these words of the text, "Neither doth God respect any person," which I have passed over in silence, are not without significance. They may be taken to imply, He who is the universal Father will not take thought for certain of His children, to the neglect of others, but has heart enough for them all.

Such, then, is the message of consolation which the Christian gathers from the famous words of the text. And if it could be proved, which it can scarcely be, that the wise woman of Tekoah had some other thought in her mind of more immediate application, as many a prophet may not have known the greatness of the message entrusted to his lips; yet shall this greatest and highest meaning never be taken away.*

And yet this word of consolation is also a word of most solemn warning. Think what a terrible thing it must be to be banished even for a short season—far worse for a long season,—from the presence of God into that outer darkness where is weeping and gnashing of teeth. To be banished from our home, from all we love, is sad even here; but men mostly have the prospect of return before long, or they hope that those they love will follow them to a distant country. But think of being banished for an indefinite time from God, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, and from spirits in bliss lying in solitude and gloom, mourning over the days that cannot be called back, and all the opportunities of grace abused. God shield us from being so gravely banished, my beloved brethren, or from being banished at all. And yet such must be our lot, unless here we Christians serve the Lord in sincerity and truth. God does not threaten without meaning. When the Lord Jesus tells us of the undying fire of God's wrath against sin, and of the worm of conscience, He means to arouse us to a sense of our great danger unless we are found in the way of peace and holiness.

But, my brethren, God's wrath is a part of God's love.* Understand with what a God of love you have to deal, who even in wrath thinketh upon mercy; and, if you are in any degree to be numbered among His banished—were it only from His holy table—seek now already in this life for full reconciliation. Understand that in a very true sense it is written, "Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation." Remember this also, that your Heavenly Father's heart already longs and is consumed to go forth to you. Absalom measured the love of his father David by the coldness of his own heart. And that is what we, in our turn, are apt to do with regard to our Heavenly Father. For, if we saw in Him the loving Father that He is, I suppose we could hardly help loving and serving Him. It is ungracious to continue one hour in banishment from God if we see the way open to our return. And the moment we lay aside our sins, that way is open to us through His Son. No Joab and no wise woman are here needed to intervene in order to move the King to compassion. Then let us avail ourselves of the means of grace devised by God here on earth that His banished be not expelled from Him. And when the absolving word of peace is spoken to us, let that word be confirmed and made good by the actions of our lives.

Finally, may we so live that when we come to die we may have the feeling that we are going home. When you die, beloved, would you not desire to go home at once? to go straightway to paradise? to be forthwith where your Saviour is? God grant that our dying lips may say with truth, I am going home. But, if it were not so, let us at least be sure that God's mercies will never be exhausted. We may not long for God, but He longs for us, here and hereafter; and He shall devise means, terrible it may be, and yet penetrated through and through with deepest love, that

---

* There is a possible exception to my text. Was this wise woman inspired? Are all sayings and all documents inserted in the Bible inspired? Be this as it may, her words are beautiful and true, and I doubt not inspired.

* How easily may this expression, God's wrath, be misunderstood. And how few preachers apprehend it aright. If God be love, then He does not put off love and put on anger. He cannot put off love. His love must direct and speak through His wrath. Love is inexorable, awful, while most tender. Love is the strongest thing in the whole Universe; in true divine love there are no weak fibres. Love, as an old writer has it, "Non parcit ut parcat." Basest teaching of all is that Christ came to save us from His Father's wrath! Christ came to reveal the love of the Father, to declare the Father. This playing off a "loving" Son against an "angry" Father is, I say, to sound the lowest depths.—"Correspondence of the Rev. T. Allin," Author of "Universalism Asserted."

His banished be not expelled from Him for ever. But, brethren, wait for no repentance beyond the grave! So pray and live here that you may not wake up in the place where there is no water, like Dives in the parable, but make now, by God's grace, your calling and election sure!

◆

ON Thursday, the 20th inst., the Lord-Lieutenant of the county (Lord Clinton) laid the corner-stone of a new cloister at the south side of Exeter Cathedral. The scheme is to restore the old cloister with a library, and the former foundation has been traced and the building erected according to the original form. The library will be over the cloister, extending from east to west. The total cost has not been estimated, but that of the portion in hand will be £4,000. The greater portion of this money is provided by bequests of the late Chancellor Harrington and the late Dean (Dr. Boyd), Canon Cook and the other Canons of the Cathedral also contributing. The £4,000 will provide five bays of the cloister, with library, staircases, and lavatories. The architect is Mr. Pearson, A.R.A.

THE annual meeting of the Parochial Missions to the Jews' Fund was held on Friday, the 21st inst., at Sion College, the Bishop of Bedford in the chair. Bishop Blyth explained the nature of the work which the committee, at his desire, were about to undertake among the Jews in Alexandria, provided the special appeal which they were about to make should meet with a sufficiently favourable response. The Bishop of Bedford urged the claims of the fund to support from Church people, on the ground that its method was best suited to the difficult circumstances in which certain East-end parishes were placed by the great influx of Jews. The report presented showed a slow but steady growth of interest in the principle of conducting evangelistic work among the Jews by means of the parochial system of the Church of England.

MRS. TEMPLE, wife of the Bishop of London, presided on Friday, the 21st inst., at a drawing-room meeting of the London branch of the Ladies' Home Mission Association, of the Society for Employing Additional Curates, held at Bridewell Hospital, New Bridge Street. Mrs. Temple briefly spoke in support of the objects of the association, and referred with regret to the loss which the society had recently suffered by the death of Mrs. Walsham How (wife of the Bishop of Bedford), who was one of the vice-presidents of the Society. The Rev. E. C. Brooke, of St. John-the-Divine, Kennington, referred to the great need of additional curates in many of our London parishes. The old voluntary Church school system was one means of great good being done among the masses. Some people said that the London School Board system would entirely sweep all voluntary Church schools out of existence, and they knew that in many cases such had been the effect of the passing of that Act. He felt persuaded, however, that provided only they had sufficient clergymen to take charge of those voluntary schools, who would show sympathy to the teachers and the scholars, the board school system, with the whole of the rates of London at its back, would not be able to touch those voluntary schools.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
From Mr. CHARLES WHEELER, Barford, Warwick.
"I have felt so greatly benefited by wearing your **ELECTROPATHIC BELT**, that it affords me pleasure to be able to testify to its **curative power.** The swelling and pain in my legs have quite left me, and I experience a comfortable and warming sensation throughout my body."
GOUT & SCIATICA CURED
Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of the **Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,** should at once stop physicing, and remit 21*s.* for HARNESS ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials POST FREE. **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1887.

PAST AND PRESENT ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

THE Royal Commission on Elementary Education will have a stirring question to deal with when it meets again. For seventeen years it has been the work of the Education Department to act as guardians, more especially of the secular instruction, by taking every precaution to prevent the "two consecutive hours" being infringed. Also it has been obliged strenuously to resist whatever might seem to wear the garb of compulsory attendance during the time allotted to religious instruction. A great wave of public opinion passed over the country in 1870. People were delighted to find that the three R's were to be drilled into the brains of all children over three and under thirteen years of age, and so the Government brought in its Bill with flying colours, in spite of the very natural protest of some who, regarding moral and religious training as the basis of all elementary education, reminded them that to read "penny dreadfuls," to write silly *billets-doux*, and to be sharp at cooking accounts would often be the only tangible results of such an imperfect system—a warning which time has shown was but too well grounded. But before the then existing schools could be utilised under State control, and others built out of the rates to supplement them, the national conscience had to be sounded, so that the hue and cry of religious liberty might be vindicated, even when raised by those who professed antagonism equally to all religions.

Was it fair, it was asked, was it just, that parents should be compelled to have their children taught the specific doctrines of a denomination to which they did not belong, and with which they had no sympathy? As a matter of fact, the great majority of schools then existing were built, supported, and in some cases had been endowed by the members of that particular denomination towards which a large proportion of the people were disaffected solely from political prejudices, whilst many more had conscientious objections arising, for the most part, from a perverted and mistaken view of its sacramental teaching. Nor were these the only sources whence the tide set in against the Church of England schools. From within, as well as from without, the waves rose angrily. Beyond doubt it was true that when children were admitted in these national schools they were expected to participate in the religious instruction which formed a prominent feature in their curriculum. To have remitted this, would have been to falsify the character of the foundation itself. Yet it was represented to the uninformed as a public oppression that the only available schools did not open their doors to the children of Nonconformists, Jews, or Infidels, while it was carefully hidden that no child had hitherto been compelled by law to attend any school, and if any or all of these classes of citizens chose to build schools for themselves, they were as free to do so as Churchmen. Neither was the truth insisted upon, that, even as it was perfectly optional *before* the Act was passed for children to attend school, so was it perfectly optional afterwards for them to be present during the religious instruction. *Then*, too, the managers were free to draw out their own time table, and alter it at discretion. *Now*, they have no control over the secular course, and the order of the studies must be signed by a Government official, or their work will not be accepted, and the children will be forced to go elsewhere. *Then* the schools were voluntary in every sense, *now* only as far as regards about three-quarters of an hour *per diem*. But if all children are now compelled to attend, and managers are obliged to admit them, they have, it may be said, *this* advantage, that they can enforce the payment of school-pence, and can earn a Government grant, which they could *not* do formerly. So far, indeed, they are on a par with Board Schools, but no further. Because they exercise the right of giving definite Church teaching, they are precluded from all share in the rates, and are obliged to make up the deficiency by private subscriptions.

A reaction has at length set in against this manifest injustice. By it, those schools which provide more than half the elementary education required by Government throughout the country are mulcted of their just and well-earned support. For years the grievance has been deprecated, not only by Church people, but by others also. This stigma upon religion is resented by Nonconformists as well as Church people, since they know that were they to build a school for the children of their own particular denomination, where their own peculiar doctrines were taught—*voluntarily*, not under compulsion—they would be denied the school rate. Here all are equally oppressed, Churchman, Protestant Dissenter, Romanist. It is not a question of church or chapel, but of God or no God, and it is felt to be so.

As evidence of this, witness the number of Nonconformists' children who are, by their parents' free will and preference, sent to Church schools for the religious instruction. Again, it is felt to be a most unfair thing that thousands of persons who contribute by choice to the support of voluntary schools under Government inspection, should be compelled to contribute to a Board School rate also. A certificate of payment to the former should exempt from the latter. How to redress these grievances the Royal Commission is now about to deliberate, and petitions on the subject, containing millions of signatures, are being prepared and forwarded from all parts of the country. Forms for signature may be obtained from the Secretary, 6, Paternoster Row, and should be returned to him before December 4th. All who value religious teaching for their children should get as many signatures as possible.

DEATH OF THE REV. EDWARD THRING.

On Saturday, the 22nd inst., the Rev. Edward Thring, who has been head master of Uppingham School since 1853, died at the school-house. As a constant and valued contributor to our pages, we deeply mourn his loss. His vivid personality, downright directness, and transparent honesty were at once apparent to all who had the privilege of his acquaintance. His words and works will, we are confident, long survive him. "A man of striking gifts and of singular strength and separateness of character (says the *Times*), he made his name a synonym for the school in whose service he lived and died. Finding there a local grammar-school of an Elizabethan foundation, he raised it in a dozen years to the scale, and soon after to the recognised dignity, of a leading public school. But his praise was not merely to have made a little state into a great one. Far more was his work remarkable as the successful effort to embody in visible shape truths of education which he was the first to give expression to. His central thought (expounded in his book 'Education and School,' 1863) was the duty of giving to boys an individual care, in teaching and in moral discipline, in contrast to the practice which even his boyish eyes had noted and condemned, of dealing with them in masses. His claim to be the pioneer in this direction—as he was in others—will bear scrutiny. Certainly he worked out in action his idea with a consistency of plan, a fidelity in details, a burnine energy, an untired enthusiasm, a readiness to takg risks and make sacrifices, and, beyond all, an indomitable quality of faith in the triumph of principle which set on his life's work a firm stamp of originality. With this comprehensiveness of conception he joined a special genius for personal influence on boys. A friendly epigrammatist described him, in a Homeric allusion, as a 'king of boys.' His personality, with its rare blending of fortitude and tenderness, had in it a magnetism which drew the steel of young hearts, the dull not less surely than the gifted. What he could do with boys was seen in the well-remembered migration of the school in 1876-7, during a visitation of fever at Uppingham, to Borth, on the Cardigan coast—a characteristic feat which confirms the saying that adventures are to the adventurous. In his later years he had won a foremost reputation, of a distinct kind, as an authority on education generally. His work on the 'Theory and Practice of Teaching' had a wide currency, and he was exerting a fast-spreading influence not in this country only, but also beyond the Atlantic, when unexpectedly, with faculties still unabated by his years and the severity of his life, he was cut down by a fatal chill at the close of his sixty-sixth year."

◆

THE TITHE QUESTION.

At Hemyock, near Tiverton, hay belonging to two of the leading tithepayers, which had been taken under distraint by the Rev. E. W. L. Popham, the rector, was sold recently by public auction by Mr. J. B. Daniels, of Taunton. The owners were Mr. Edward Sutley, of Whitehall, whose arrears were (with costs) £31 10s. 9d., and Mr. J. Clist, of Mountshayne, whose arrears (with costs) were £11 7s. The dispute with the rector had its origin in his refusal to allow what was thought an adequate reduction on the tithe, and the farmers considered their grievance aggravated by the spirit in which their proposals to discuss the situation were met. The sale of the hay was in itself a very formal matter. For each lot there was a single bid of the amount for which distraint had been made, and it was at once knocked down to a friendly purchaser. A good-humoured crowd attended the auction, making some demonstration with a couple of flags and an effigy. At the conclusion of the auction an indignation meeting was held. Mr. S. Farrant, of Westown, who was voted to the chair, said they were met to protest against the iniquitous tithe law which pressed severely on the farmers. They would have been conciliated had the rector met them kindly, but this he declined to do, telling them to take their own course. They had done so. (Cheers.) That day's proceedings were the result, and in a few days he would be glad to meet them at Westown under similar circumstances. He had pledged himself not to pay the tithe, and he would not do so. Mr. E. Lutley moved a resolution to the effect that the Tithe Commutation Act failed to prevent excessive tithes; that no alteration of the law which merely shifted the liability from the occupier to the owner would be satisfactory without also providing that the amount charged should be in just proportion to the value of the produce of the land. He traced the progress of the tithe agitation in Hemyock, criticising adversely the nature of the rector's replies to their communications to him. The parson of Hemyock, he said, was like the Jew of old—he stood upon his bond; and he (the speaker) would back the Christian Shylock of Hemyock against the most grasping Jew who ever grovelled upon God's earth. (Cheers.) Churchmen and Dissenters, Liberals and Tories, they were all associated in these distraints. He had taken some trouble to go through the tithe apportionments of the parish. It seemed to him that the land throughout Hemyock was worth about £1 an acre for renting, and the tithe was about 4s. or 5s.—a fifth or fourth, instead of a tenth. (Shame.) A fair tithe charge he was ready to pay. Incidentally he remarked that they received many advantages from good landlords, but what had they received from the parson of Hemyock — a fellow running about with horses and dogs, a cold-blooded, haughty priest? (Cheers.) Mr. C. W. Hawkins, of Culmstock, seconded the resolution, in support of which Mr. Brown, a Baptist minister from Culmstock, also spoke. The resolution was carried with loud applause.

◆

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

THE IRISH CHURCH CATECHISM.

Sir,—Canon Crosthwaite, in his letter on the Catechism in yesterday's Pulpit, says:—"With us (the Church of Ireland) the object was to get rid of priest and bread, as necessary in order to the due reception of the grace of the Eucharist. It was attempted to make faith the only mean to the exclusion of any on God's part. How far our Puritans have succeeded, our new question and answer can speak for themselves."

If the object of those who recommended and effected the adoption of the new question and answer was to get rid of priest and bread, as necessary, &c., they went about the attainment of that object in a way from which I am unable to perceive how that was their object. Priest, to use the awkward form of expression in the above quotation from your correspondent, is not got rid of. The word priest does not occur in the Catechism, nor in the 28th Article; therefore it is not got rid of, for you cannot get rid of a thing that you never had. Bread is not got rid of; for the word does not occur in the question and answer of the Catechism antecedent to the new question and answer, nor does it occur in the clause of the Article from which the new answer is taken. Even had the matter been different, and had the new question and answer left out mention of Priest and Bread, those being actually mentioned in the antecedent part of the Catechism, and in the clause of the Article utilised, Priest and Bread would still not have been got rid of. The Communion Service, wherein the Priest, in his ministerial, and also, as I believe, in his sacrificial capacity, consecrates the elements, and delivers them to the faithful, remains as it has been for more than two centuries, its intent and purport unaffected, in any manner whatever, by the enlarged interpretation of its *modus operandi* contained in the new question and answer.

If it was attempted to make faith the only mean—to the exclusion of any on God's part—to the due reception of the grace of the Eucharist, I contend that this statement of the attempt, the object, is logically incorrect. All that was attempted was what was effected, the introduction into the Catechism of the explanatory words in the 28th Article. That Article lays down that "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." *The mean* implies the only mean; and implies so correctly. Faith is the only *mean* whereby grace is received; the elements in the Eucharist are the vehicle by which grace is conveyed. The objection that is made to the wording of the new answer, and inferentially to the wording of the article, is based on an illogical confusion of *mean* and *vehicle.*

How well the Puritans or Low Church party of the Church of Ireland have succeeded in their object, the new question and answer of the Catechism can tell. We are referred by Canon Crosthwaite, not to Committee Reports and Synod debates, and so forth, to divine the purpose of the Church of Ireland in improving the Church Catechism. We are referred to the recorded result of the Church's action. And rightly so. To discover the intention, or the object of a law, you should go to the law itself, and not to the debates upon it when it was under consideration. The conclusion is, that whatever may have been the object of this, that, or the other person in the Synod of the Irish Church, when advocating the addition to the Catechism, the elimination of "priest and bread" has been unaccomplished, and has not been even pointed at.

I cannot conclude this letter without asking a question, not of or pointed at, your present correspondent certainly. Why do some people when they groundlessly accuse the Church of Ireland of "getting rid of bread" (what nonsense and what English !), not accuse us also of getting rid of wine? Do they want to suggest the abolition of communion in both kinds?

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

October 23rd, 1887.

◆

THE QUESTION AND ANSWER IN PREFACE TO NEW IRISH PRAYER BOOK.

SIR,—I thought I had done with Mr. Lawrence. So long as he confined himself to vague accusations of impudence and such like Billingsgate, so long I was patient. But "slander," "dishonesty," "falsehood," and "misquoting to sustain slander," is what no honest man can sit quiet under. I must therefore restate the question *de novo*, so bear with me. Don't say that England has nothing to do with it. If ever revision is upon you, the whole game will be played in your Convocation, as it was with us. Our Synod contained three parties, as yours will, High, Low and Broad. The High, with one of the others, might have stood its ground. But it could not against the other two combined. Thus the Broad, perhaps, did not wish the baptismal service altered. It consented to please the Low. The Low did not want our Lord's Incarnation in the Athanasian Creed put out. It consented to please the Broad. I think both agreed as to the new question and answer. I must view them in three stages. 1st, in the Synod; 2nd, in Committee's Report; 3rd, in the New Preface. Thus there would be, 1st, a debate in Parliament; 2nd, Resolutions; 3rd, the Bill. It is absurd to say, as Mr. Lawrence does, that by referring to the two first steps I am drawing a red-herring across the scent. All must stand or fall together.

1st, in the Synod. When the question and answer were mooted, the High party wanted to use the words of the Article, "given, taken, and eaten," the two others would not have them, or explain them at all. They were too "full" for them. They would have none but the words of the Catechism, "taken and received." From the Synod we come next to

2. The Report of the Revision Committee. The object written on every page was to get rid of priest and bread, and to make faith or man's fitness the sole mean. They prepared the new question and answer I have hinted this already in a former letter. They spoke thus, p. 29: "The teaching of the Catechism on this subject appears to us as we have said, to be less full than that of the Articles." No doubt it *is* less full, for it has nothing about "giving," or "eating." But *that* was a virtue, not a fault in their eyes. What they called it "less full" for is, that it did not say that the sole mean is faith. This was the "less full" of the Catechism, which was to be remedied. But I must finish the words of the Report; "The teaching, etc. less full, we have thought it desirable that the following question and answer, taken from the 28th Article, should be added." Here the language is as plain as possible. Question and answer are both to be taken from the 28th Article. Now this is not what was actually done, as we shall see presently. That both are here, in Report, said to be taken from the Article is plain, and Mr. Lawrence cannot deny it. But we have another passage at p. 12, to which the words "as we have said" refer. It runs thus: "the teaching of the Catechism, is not, upon this point, as full as that of the Articles; and we have thought it desirable that a new question and answer, taken from the latter, should be introduced into it." After this no one can deny that the Report said that both question and answer should be taken from the 28th Article. We now come to

3. The words of the New Preface, "We have made no other change than to add to the Catechism one question, with an answer taken out of the 28th of the said Articles"; the only change from the recommendation twice mentioned in Report, is that "a new," or "the following," question *and* answer, has in its place "one question *with* an answer," and that the comma, which the Report twice over puts after answer, the Preface puts after question. On this is built the extraordinary theory, that it is only the answer that is *said* to be taken from the Article, and not the question also. We are to believe that the statement, twice made in Report, that *both* are to be taken from the Article, is contradicted in the Preface; and this solely by "with" being put for "and," and the moving of the comma from after answer to after question. If those who drew up the New Preface meant to tell us plainly that it is only the answer that is from the Article, whilst the question is from the Catechism, why could they not have said so—"question from one source, and answer from another"; or "both from two sources combined"? Why not? Because, having rejected the Catechism as "less full," they were ashamed to own that they adopted its "taken and received" *precisely* because it *was* "less full" than the "given and eaten" of the Article. The language of the Article was left out, because its "given and eaten" are so full. This was done to get rid of priest and bread, and to throw dust in people's eyes, they are told that both are taken from the Articles. *Both,* I say, for setting aside quibbles about "with" for "and," and the location of the comma, the language of the Preface must in honesty be understood by that of the Report, both having been adopted and sanctioned by the same men, with very few exceptions. The drawers-up of both Report and Preface were, as I have said, the same men. The Report, in two separate places, says "we have thought it desirable that a new question and answer taken from the latter (the Article) should be introduced into it" (the Catechism, p. 12). We have the same in effect at p. 29, giving the question and answer, which it says plainly are taken both from

the Article alone. Then comes the Preface, by the same hands, which says: "Add to the Catechism one question, with an answer taken out of the 28th of the said Articles." The same men, who said that they would take *both* out of the Article, are now to be saved from a mis-statement as to the source from which both are really taken, by the movement of a comma, and the substitution of a "with" for an "and." I really think Mr. Lawrence, if a friend to the writers of the Preface, would do better to say that the whole thing, from beginning to end of both Report and Preface, was a mistake and a slip—scarcely, I grant, conceivable. Better to say this, than that the Preface was a deliberate mystification, sought to be effected by moving a comma, and putting a "with" for an "and."

I trust I have proved that I have not slandered the men who signed both Report and Preface. I have shown that they promised, twice over, to take a question and answer both from the Article alone. I have shown that they did not do so. I have freed them from the charge, that, by means of a change of comma and a single word, they meant to tell the world that they were not doing what they said they would do, that is, take all from the Article.

The charge of slander, etc., is an arrow easily shot. But it often returns on the head of him that shot it. It then is like a pitch cap, where it fits, it sticks; and, like Dejanira's tunic, is torn off only with life itself.

EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.

P.S.—Since writing the above, I have seen Mr. Lawrence's of the 8th inst. He speaks of a debate in our Synod about the comma. I never heard of such debate; and think that his memory must deceive him. How any could have said that a comma put in purposely could signify nothing, is strange, even if, as he courteously says, a man could be found "whose knowledge of English composition was about equal to" mine. If a debate arose as to the meaning of the sentence in the Preface, is it conceivable that it would not have been settled by saying plainly: "A question from Catechism, and an answer from Article?" But, alas! the Catechism which was quoted had been snuffed out, as "less full," so that could not be done, and all was to be left to the comma. Then remember that the committee who passed the Preface, had already said in Report, p. 12, "We have thought it desirable that a new question and answer taken from the latter (the Article) should be introduced." Is not this too plain to be upset by a comma? And, again, at p. 29, "We have thought it desirable that the following question and answer, taken from the Article should be added." When the men who penned these assertions as to what *they meant* to do, put in a statement to a contrary effect, depending on a comma, instead of owning that the question was taken from the despised "less full" Catechism—when they did this, the less said about the matter the better. If such a debate did occur about the comma, it would only prove that there was no oversight, but a deliberate throwing of dust in men's eyes, pretending to take from one source what was really taken from another. For pity's sake, Mr. Lawrence should let the matter rest—sometimes stirring up only makes the odour the worse. I wish some one who was in the Synod, when the comma debate took place, would come forward and tell us his recollections—ten years is not a very long space of time for a man to recall anything so remarkable. I am tempted to perpetrate the most atrocious pun on the absurd and comma-cal attempt to reconcile the promises with the act of the same individual, the promise to do one thing, and the actual performance of the very opposite.

◆

HE WHO CATECHISES FORMS THE MIND OF YOUTH.

SIR,—In a former letter I sketched out the changes which our Romanising brethren would have to make in the Catechism, before, what Froude, fifty years ago, called the broken bone of Reformation can be properly reset. But, in addition to these changes, a new question and answer will have to be inserted. "Why must we believe in a local adorable presence in the Holy Eucharist?" Answer, "Because that faith is the mean whereby the grace or gift is received." When this is done, "these Thy creatures" must be removed from the Eucharistic Service. These "species" cannot be called "creatures"; and we cannot worship "creatures." I see in the *Church Times* for October 21st, that the 39 Articles are sneered at, as "the embers of our extinct quarrels." Of course the 4th Article must be got rid of, which says that our Lord's Body ascended with, and retains, the "same limitations as to place, as appertain to the perfection of man's nature." The 15th Article says that this nature, with which our Lord ascended, "is like unto ours, in all things, sin only excepted." So these two "embers of our extinct quarrels" will also have to be eliminated.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

Reviews and Notices.

"LESSONS ON THE WORKS OF OUR LORD AND ON THE CLAIMS OF OUR LORD." By F. S. COOK, D.D. London: James Nisbet & Co.

IN his preface the author says: "In preparing these lessons it has been the writer's intention to give teachers of Bible-classes, of Sunday-school senior classes, and others, two sets of studies, the one, and likewise the other, being sufficiently complete in itself; and which, when they are taken in connection with two preceding sets, will present a fairly full view of our Lord Jesus Christ as He is set forth in the Old and in the New Testament. There were reasons for making all the lessons short, and the book comprising them small."

As the book is designed for Sunday-school teachers, we have given it to one and asked for an opinion. That opinion is favourable, so we can recommend the book to other teachers.

◆

"THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER." J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D., DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH. London: James Nisbet & Co.

THIS is a little book of eighty-eight pages, in rather large print, and costs only one shilling; but books are not valuable only according to size and price. And indeed a large book on this subject is not really needful, for doctrinal controversies thereon must be settled by our Saviour's own words, and they are few in number. On some doctrines, light is thrown by history, science, or fresh information; none of these can alter our Saviour's meaning on the night of His betrayal; it is precisely a case where the rule applies—Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture. What our Saviour meant at the time He spoke, must here be the meaning for all time; although, fresh thoughts and ideas, which legitimately arise from that meaning, may be drawn out and developed; but Christ's meaning is decisive and must be gathered from His own words. But the Romanist may reply—of course; and Christ said This is My body—and may then go on to deduce from these words his own doctrine.

But can Christ's words have such a meaning here, if they be compared with His other reported sayings and with other Scriptures. If the Romanists are right, and "This [substance of bread] is My body," then there ARE occasions when "what goeth in at the mouth" purifieth a man, and what Christ said here, becomes in principle exactly contrary to what He had previously taught His disciples, and He becomes inconsistent with Himself. But if we interpret, This unity with Me, symbolised by our joint participation in this bread and wine, makes you My Body; then we interpret consistently with Christ's teaching about the Vine and the Branches, the Shepherd and the Sheep; and with all He said about "eating His flesh" (St. John vi.), and also consistently with St. Paul's metaphors to the Corinthians and Ephesians. To St. Paul the Church—not bread or the substance of bread, changed or unchanged; or anything material was Christ's body; and it was so, only so long as it was in union with Christ in His Life, Death, and Resurrection.

We have nowhere given Dean Perowne's actual words, but we think we have fairly represented the line his very valuable little book takes. On page 12 he says: "The Church is [Christ's] body, and in [our] participation of the bread and wine we express our communion, our fellowship, one with another, and the one loaf is a witness to us of our oneness with Christ." We hope this little book will have a large circulation.

◆

"THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW." October, 1887. London: James Nisbet & Co.

WE wish that the editor of the *Review* would follow the example of the editor of the *Expositor*, and give us a few good—thoroughly good—articles instead of so large a number as fifteen, not one of which is really able. Of a good magazine article we always make a note, so that at any future time when studying the subject of which it treats, we may refer to it; but there is nothing worthy of reference in this number of the *Evangelical Review*. None of the articles are really good; much the worst is that on "Infallible Scripture," by E. S. Burr, D.D. According to this writer, the "original Scriptures, as they came fresh from the hands of the sacred penmen, were infallible in all their statements of whatever sort." Dr. Burr gets over the obvious difficulty that these originals are lost, and that existing copies vary, by the astonishing statement that "in by far the greater part of the Scripture text, say nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of the whole, the copies agree with one another." A little further on Dr. Burr says that "words and syntaxes in Scripture, as elsewhere, may vary without damage to the sense, without damage, also, the sense itself may vary somewhat." Somewhat! Then, are small variations "in sense" consistent with "infallibility," but not large ones? On page 761, he speaks of the Septuagint, as having, in our Saviour's day, "come down through the glooms and tossings of many troublous centuries." Does Dr. Burr remember the date of the Septuagint?

Dr. Paton Gloag gives a good summary of recent literature on the Ignatian epistles. Like the Bishop of Durham he maintains their genuineness, and praises their enthusiasm, which he rightly declares to be refreshing "in this cold calculating age," and "worthy of praise rather than of blame." Doctrinally also he considers them valuable, because Christ's Incarnation, Divinity and Humanity are directly and prominently taught, but adds that their chief value "consists in the nature of the ecclesiastical organisation which they disclose." This we can hardly agree with, and it does not seem to us consistent with a statement on the next page but one (639) that his views on episcopacy were "personal," and "not the sentiments of the "Church in general." So early as the days of Ignatius we should say the views of the "Church in general" on episcopacy were not distinctly defined; Church organisation was different in different places; why, then, should one man's opinion be of such great value?

The article on Prebendary Row's book on Future Punishment, by Rev. J. Robinson Gregory, is written with perfect fairness as far as we can judge. Mr. Gregory does not agree with Dr. Row; but we have seen all sorts of opinions regarding this book. Perhaps it is impossible to avoid reviewing books of this kind subjectively.

Other articles are on David Hume; Clerical Life in Ireland; Jacob Böhme, and four which treat of metaphysical subjects, all very short.

◆

THE meetings of the Church Society at Cambridge have been resumed; they will in future be held in the Henry Martyn Hall. It is a very handsome room, well lighted, warmed, and seated, and the acoustic properties seem to be excellent. At the meeting last Wednesday week Mr. F. Watson, of St. John's, read a paper on "Inspiration." The programme for the term includes an address on Missions, on St. Andrew's Eve, by Professor Westcott; weekly devotional meetings conducted by the Master of Trinity; a sermon by Mr. J. Llewelyn Davies; and the following papers —"Sunday and the Sabbath," by A. C. Crommelin, B.A. Trinity; "The Assyrian Church and the Archbishop's Mission," by Mr. Athelstan Riley; and "Christianity and War," by A. E. Brooke, B.A. of King's.

THE Bishop of Ely invited all members of the electoral roll of the University of Cambridge to take part in the archidiaconal conference which was held on Monday, the 24th inst., and a considerable number responded to the invitation: the afternoon session was particularly largely attended. The proceedings commenced with a choral celebration at Great St. Mary's. Professor Creighton and Mr. Sedley Taylor spoke at the morning session on the work of the Church in connection with the special needs of the present day. Professor Westcott and Principal Moule addressed the conference in the afternoon on the spiritual life. In the evening there was a working men's meeting similar to those at the Congress, when the Master of Trinity and Professor Creighton were among the speakers.

COUNT LEO TOLSTOI has been interviewed by Mr. Kennan, who has elicited from him in a nutshell the whole principle of the Count's mysterious religious views. Down at Yasnaya Polyand, in the province of Tula, the most famous of Russian authors is still living the life of a labourer, emerging only now and then, when weighty philosophical questions are discussed at Moscow or St. Petersburg. He was coming home from his work in the fields, dressed like a peasant, his face and neck bronzed by the sun, and his grey hair parted on the forehead and cut all round the head, peasant fashion. Mr. Kennan, after having explained the reason of his visit, was invited into a bare white-washed room, where the conversation turned on Mr. Kennan's recent experiences in Siberia. He described the miserable life of the convicts in glowing colours, and burning with indignation. Count Tolstoi remained strangely calm at the account of all the misery, and after being asked whether he did not think that, under such oppression, resistance became a duty, he said: "That depends on what you mean by resistance. If you mean persuasion, reasoning, peaceful representation, I am with you; if you mean violence, I say No." With grave, calm eloquence, the man in the labourer's dress, with grey hair and glittering eyes, talked a long time on the subject, and to all the cases of brutal cruelty which Mr. Kennan put before him, he still, when questioned, replied, "No, you must not have recourse to cruelty." Then his interviewer tested the Count's views to the utmost point, by telling him the story of a young girl, honest, well educated, heroic even, whom he had seen among the prisoners in Siberia. Condemned for political conspiracy, with several hundred young people of her age, she had been brought to Krasnoyarsk, in Eastern Siberia. There the local Governor gave the order that she should exchange her own dress for that of the convicts. Rightly or wrongly, the girl thought that political prisoners were exempt from this indignity, and refused to obey. Then ensued a horrible scene of violence. Seized by five or six men, against whom she resisted to the very end, she was stripped, knocked down, and, bleeding and naked, held down by the men, and then forcibly pressed into the convicts' dress. Having given all the details of this revolting scene, Mr. Kennan continued: "And now suppose this had happened under your eyes; suppose that this young girl, who was so barbarously treated, had asked for your protection; suppose she had been your daughter—would you have hesitated to defend her by force?" Count Tolstoi remained silent for a moment; his eyes were filled with tears, and finally he said, "Are you quite sure that this has really happened?" "As sure as one can possibly be." He relapsed into silence, and then, evading the direct question, the Count replied: "Even in a similar case the using of force would not be justified. The Governor of Krasnoyarsk is a brute. The soldiers charged with the execution of his order are brutes, but this does not give you the right to go down to their level. Suppose you had just been able to prevent this revolting injustice by killing three of the soldiers? Where would be the advantage? Other soldiers, as unconscientious as the former, would have finished that which you would only have retarded, and there would have been at least three dead men. At the moment of your intervention there would have been only one centre of evil. Afterwards there would have been three or four, if not more. This, Mr. Kennan, is not the way to establish the reign of peace on earth."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beardmore, Rev. Henry Leslie, M.A., Senior Curate of St. Nicholas's, Brighton; Vicar of Halton, Hastings.

Blyth, Rev. Thomas Allen, M.A., Vicar of Stoke, Coventry, and Vice-Chairman of the Foleshill Board of Guardians Chaplain of Coventry Union.

Boynton, Rev. C. I. W., Vicar of Steeton; Vicar of Carleton, near Selby.

Burville, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Curate; Rector of Yelling, Hunts.

Campbell, Rev. Herbert Ernest, M.A., Curate of St. Michael's, Chester Square; Vicar of St. George's, Millom, Cumberland.

Child, Rev. Cyril C., Travelling Organising Secretary to the Universities' Mission for the North of England.

Clarke, Rev. William Shuttleworth, M.A., Vicar of Welsh Newton and Llanrothall; Vicar of Marstow and Pencoyd, Herefordshire.

Coleman, Rev. Leighton, D.D., late Organising Secretary, Church of England Temperance Society for Diocese of Oxford; Rector of Sayre, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

Collins, Rev. Percy Herbert, M.A., Curate of St. Stephen's, Paddington; Rector of High Halden, Kent.

Davies, Rev. John, M.A., Curate of Lockwood; Vicar of Newsome, Huddersfield.

Fowler, Rev. W. W., M.A., Head Masrer of the Cathedral Grammar School; Prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral.

Greep, Rev. R. O., Curate of the St. John-the-Evangelist's, Walton-on-the-Hill; Incumbent of Ainsdale, Southport.

Hales, Rev. Stephen Elmer, M.A., Curate of St. Clement's and of St. Mary's, Sandwich.

Hall, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Vicar of Linton, Cambridgeshire; Rector of Glemsford, Suffolk.

Kendall, Rev. G. W., Curate of Bradford Parish Church; Vicar of St. Augustine's, Attercliffe, Bradford.

Lister, Rev. J. Maxfield, Vicar of St. Peter's Church, Allendale, Northumberland; Vicar of Steeton, Leeds.

Maitland, Rev. Hugh Fuller, Curate of Burghfield, Reading; Rector of Kelly, Devonshire.

Molineux, Rev. C. H., Incumbent of St. James-the-Great, Derby; Rector of Staveley, Derbyshire.

Phillips, Rev. Sydney, M.A., Vicar of Kidderuinster.

Spicer, Rev, J. M., Curate of Kirk Michael; Chaplain of Laxey, Isle of Man.

Straffey, Rev. R., B.A., Vicar of Evesham; Rural Dean of Evesham.

Stuart, Rev. Douglas, Curate of All Souls', Leeds; Vicar of Ipplepen, near Newton Abbot.

Wheeler, Rev. G. D., Vicar of Wolford and Honorary Canon of Worcester; Rural Dean of South Kineton.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Balston, Rev. Charles, B.D., formerly Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and lately Rector of Stoke Charity, at Penenden Cottage, Maidstone, on the 16th inst., aged 76.

Bond, Rev. W., for forty-eight years Rector of Beauchamp Roding, Essex, on Saturday, the 23rd inst., aged 92 years and 7 months.

Gyles, Rev. George, B.A., at Martley Villa, St. Mark's Road, Notting Hill, on the 21st inst., aged 60.

Harrison, Rev. William Estcourt, Vicar of Sturton-le-Steeple, at Sturton-le-Steeple, Lincoln, on the 17th inst., aged 78 years.

Horton, Rev. Sir George Lewis Wilmot, Bart., at Catton Hall, on the 24th inst., aged 62.

Richards, Rev. William Steward, M.A. (Oxon), for forty-five years Rector of Terwick, on the 18th inst., aged 78.

Roberts, Rev. George, B.A., Rector of Beechamwell-with-Shingham, Norfolk, formerly of St. John's, Cheltenham, at Flushing, very suddenly, on the 20th inst., aged 80.

Sewell, Rev. Edward, M.A., sometime Principal of Ilkley College, and late of the College, Grange-over-Sands, at Fulneck, on the 20th inst.

Twysden, Rev. Thomas, at Charleton Rectory, aged 86.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ENCOURAGED BY THE EXAMPLE OF JOSHUA.

By the Bishop of CARLISLE.

Sermon Preached before the Church Congress in Lichfield Cathedral, on Wednesday, October 5th, 1887.

> "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest."—Joshua i. 9.

THESE were very encouraging words uttered at a very discouraging time. Moses was dead; the great lawgiver and leader was gone; the head and the hand upon which Joshua and all the people were accustomed to lean could be leant upon no longer; the Jordan had not been passed; the promised land had not yet been reached. Nevertheless the words of promise remained. Moses had left his people with the language of confidence and exultation upon his lips—"The eternal God is thy refuge"—these were some of the words of his parting blessing—"and underneath are the everlasting arms; . . . Israel shall dwell in safety alone; . . . happy art thou, O Israel; who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Lord?" Parting words such as these would be a great support; the spirit of Moses would be still present, though Moses himself was gone. And so the history seems to flow on in its natural channel when we find the Book of Joshua commencing with the message, "Moses, My servant, is dead; now therefore arise, and go over this Jordan!"

It was a great epoch in Israelitish history; it needed courage on the part of both leaders and people; it needed faith in God; it needed union and confidence among themselves; and therefore, perhaps, we are not surprised to find exhortations to courage administered to Joshua's mind: three times over the exhortation comes, "Be strong and of a good courage;" "Only be strong and very courageous;" and, again, in the words of my text, "Have I not commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest." I said that the exhortation comes three times, but I might have said four, for the people themselves took up the cry; and so we read that when Joshua commanded the officers of the people to pass through the host, and bid them make preparations for passing the Jordan, some of them answered, saying, "All that thou commandest us we will do, and whithersoever thou sendest us we will go; . . . only be strong and of a good courage." No wonder that Joshua went towards the promised land with a confidence of victory when he received such a message of encouragement from heaven, and such an echo to the message from the hearts of his people.

Now, I am pressing a very trite and familiar lesson when I say that in all important matters which any of us are called upon to undertake the condition of success is a belief in God's presence and sanction, combined with personal determination and courage—"Have not I commanded thee?"—that is one part of the condition. "Be strong and of a good courage"—that is the other part. In the ordinary life of a Christian man, beset by dangers and difficulties and temptations, these are the chief conditions of victory and of obtaining the promised crown. In our daily work, whether the secular work of a layman or the spiritual work of a priest, success is granted upon the same conditions. It is our privilege as members of Christ, children of God, and heirs of heaven, to know that in all situations in which we can find ourselves on this side of the Jordan, we need have no fear if only we "are strong and of a good courage," as believing that "the Lord our God is with us whithersoever we go."

The lesson is scarcely less trite and less familiar if the army of Israel, with Joshua at its head, crossing over Jordan and claiming the land of Canaan as their inheritance, be regarded as a type of the Church of God in all ages—specially of the Christian Church under the Greater Joshua, even Jesus Christ, the Son of God—fighting against every kind of evil and claiming the dominion of the world for its rightful King. These old and general lessons—trite and familiar because they are old and general—are, however, as you may suppose, not exactly those which I have in mind. On a special occasion like the present I desire rather to take what I may call a Church Congress view of the teaching which my text and its context are calculated to impress; and accordingly I would endeavour to persuade you, if you need persuading, how much the strength of the Church of England to do good work, her prosperity in the highest sense of the word, her safety from her foes, her prospect of ever-growing usefulness, depend upon these two conditions, upon which so many other spiritual successes depend: belief in God's presence and sanction, personal determination and courage. "Have not I commanded thee?" Which of us will doubt that the Church of England has received this great commission? "Be strong and of a good courage." Which of us does not perceive and own that unless this condition be fulfilled even the commission of God Himself may be vain and unprofitable?

Perhaps it may be said that the true course is to be found by regarding, equally and co-ordinately, these two conditions of success. A priest may glory in the thought that his orders come by undoubted descent from the Apostles, that is, from Jesus Christ Himself; he may feel proportionately confident in his title to minister the Word and Sacraments; he may regard with sorrow and possibly with indignation any unauthorised claim to minister in holy things; and yet he may find, as a matter of fact, that in dealing with souls, in bringing the message of God home to the conscience, in converting sinners from the error of their ways, somehow a half-educated mechanic can do wonderful works which he cannot do. On the other hand, another priest, of another school, may virtually lose sight of his legitimate authority and of the mighty and mysterious commission that was given to him " by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbyter," and may put himself on a level with a preaching layman, because he shrinks from unduly magnifying his office. Will not he most truly and most successfully do the work of the priesthood who keeps most clearly before his eyes the commission which God has given him, and who at the same time depends least upon the prerogatives of his office and most upon personal effort and activity? or, as perhaps I might more correctly say, who works with strength and a good courage, just because He is persuaded of God's covenanted presence, and is sure that his ordination was a true commission from Christ Himself?

And what is true of individual ministers of the Church of England is true of the Church as a whole. The Church, if we may personify her, will do her duty best when, like the individual minister, she most realises the validity of her commission and also the need of activity. "Have not I commanded thee?" are words which the Church should ever inscribe upon her banner; "Be strong and of a good courage" are words which should be the motto of her whole life. When I speak of the validity of the commission of the Church of England I mean to uphold the position that it is not justice to herself and her children, nor kindness to any one, that she should merge her claims to the allegiance and love of the people in the chaos of religious bodies. She must not pose as one of the sects, nor allow herself to be so regarded. She must have a distinct belief, and must teach her children carefully and clearly as to the difference which exists between herself and the Romanists on the one hand, and the Protestant sects on the other. There is no want of charity in holding this belief; if there be not an essential difference the position of the Church of England is a schismatical and false position; it is because the Church knows that her position is not schismatical, but that she is the true representative of the Catholic Church of Christ in England, that she feels that she can confidently invite all to her bosom, and promise to all who will come the full satisfaction of all their spiritual wants. "Come unto me," she may say, adopting the words of her Divine Lord, "all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

But while all this is true, it is equally true that it would be as foolish for the Church herself as for any one of her ministers to rest upon her position or her claims. Active work, as though she had nothing but activity to depend upon, is one grand condition of success. And oh! what a splendid field for activity is that which the Church of England has open to her!—a foothold, and more than a foothold, a recognised and honoured position, in every town and village and hamlet throughout the land, the recognised right of way into hall and cottage, a place in the heart of the people which is proved in a hundred ways to be deep and real. What a grand spiritual machinery too is that which the Church of England possesses in her endowed and married priesthood, her English Prayer-book, her ancient churches, her sweet music, her orderly and beautiful (if not gorgeous) ritual! As things are now, I think it may be confidently stated that the happy mean between the hill and the valley, of which George Herbert sings so quaintly, is hit more truly than it was in his time, or than it has been at any time since Reformation days. And because I know that it is futile to talk in a too general way concerning the position and the spiritual machinery of the Church of England—because I shrink from generalities, which may be the mere cloaks for nakedness, or grave-clothes which conceal a skeleton or a corpse—therefore I will assert that which I trust will be admitted to be true—namely, that the work which is being done by the Church (I mean in this case by the word "Church" the clergy) at the present time is far greater and wider and deeper than was ever done before. He who occupies the position of a Bishop or overseer knows better than others, from the nature of the case, what defects and weaknesses exist in the work of the clergy; he can put his finger on a parish here and say, "That parish almost breaks my heart"; he can point to another parish there, in which the wounds inflicted by some former pastor (as in irony he must be called) are still unhealed; and he probably knows of many in which more might be done than is done, in which he has to complain of sloth or of faltering lips or of weak hands and feeble knees. These things, I suppose, must be: "It must needs be that offences come"; England would not be England, but an earthly Paradise, if things were not so. Nevertheless, there is another side of the subject which the Bishop sees more clearly than any one else can see it, and which not only gladdens his heart but goes far to astonish him; he knows the labour of zeal and love which is being carried on for the "feeding and providing for the Lord's family, the seeking for Christ's sheep that are scattered abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever." He knows of parishes which are models of what parishes ought to be, and he knows the efforts of time and study and wisdom and tact, and the wrestlings in prayer, by means of which these parishes have been made what they are; he perceives, too, that the undoubtedly strong current of the stream of clerical life and work is in the direction of activity, so that if a man of less spiritual earnestness than some of the best of his neighbours suffers himself to drift with the stream, he will not be carried into the sluggish pool of formality and indifference, but into the flood of the rising tide of spiritual life. This is what an English Bishop sees and knows concerning his diocese in these our days; and when he regards the prospect in connection with that outer view which is patent to the whole world, the restored and beautified and multiplied churches—the parsonage in almost every village bearing witness to the fact that the evil of non-residence has been abolished, and that with rare exceptions each parish has its own resident priest—the Mission-rooms and Mission-work—the manifest order and decency and abundance of the public services of the Church—when he sees all these things, which every one may see, which religious dissenters candidly and even thankfully acknowledge, and which the bitterest opponent of the Church cannot deny, then he feels that he may "thank God and take courage"; yea, he may seem to hear such words as these repeated in his ears, "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest!"

In truth, in a well-ordered English parish I profess honestly that I think there is little or nothing to be desired for the spiritual good of the parishioners; and as it has been truly said that the end of all legislation is to get twelve honest men into a jury-box, so it may be said that the end of all ecclesiastical organisation is to get a zealous, wise, orthodox, pure-minded, pure-lived priest into every parish. Given your parochial system and your clergy to work it, and given an abstention on the part of foolish friends and (as I think) equally foolish foes from meddling with and marring the present position of the Church of England, and I am disposed to believe that almost all is done which needs to be done for the spiritual benefit of the people.

Nevertheless, it is impossible to shut our eyes to the fact that we cannot rest upon such easy ground as this. One purpose, perhaps the chief purpose, of a Church Congress is to call attention to the truth that we must not and cannot rest in these days, as our fathers did in days gone by, upon our parochial system, and upon that only. There are great questions and great interests with which the Church of England must deal as one united organic whole, and for neglect of which questions and interests no amount of parochial life and activity can entirely compensate. It may be that the utterances of a Congress are inarticulate and incomplete; it may be that the very existence of a Congress testifies to the ruined and shattered condition of our ecclesiastical organisation, and makes us feel more than ever the need of some Congress which shall be more than a Congress is now, some gathering of the whole Church of England in such a manner as shall render it possible for her to speak with something like authority, and to cut some of those mischievous knots which at present impede her influence and her progress. All this may be so; but it seems to me that our wisest course is to endeavour to deal with pressing questions as we can, not like children to cry for the moon, but to use such means as are within our reach for getting rid of any obstacles which lie in the Church's way, and in any serious degree interfere with her progress.

And this leads me to remark that so long as the Church of England enjoys the title "the Church as by law established" she must be dependent in many important respects upon Acts of Parliament. In some sense this would, of course, be true if the union between Church and State were severed; but until that severance takes place, if it should be so, the dependence upon Parliament is an undoubted factor in every ecclesiastical problem. And so far as one House of Parliament is concerned there is no practical difficulty—the Church is abundantly represented in the House of Lords; and the history of last session, and of many sessions, sufficiently proves that there is no difficulty in obtaining in the House of Lords respectful attention to any question in which the Church, and through the Church the nation, is interested. But the case is very different with the other House: circumstances with which we are all acquainted, and which I need not specify, render it well-nigh impossible, I will not say to pass, but to obtain a discussion for any important measure; and the result is that things which every good man, whether Churchman or not, confesses ought to be done remain in a most woeful manner undone. Now, I think it is well worthy of the Church of England, assembled in voluntary and informal congresses, to consider whether this condition of things might not be somewhat altered. Is the majority of the whole population of England to have no hearing? Has the Church no grievances to redress, and no voice to make those grievances heard? Are we so politically insignificant (to take that secular but practical ground) that we cannot persuade the Ministry of the Crown that it would be right and wise to do justice to the Church of England?

I have often wondered why it is that the Church's voice is so ineffective in Parliament, and I have come to the conclusion that the reason is to be found very much in our own want of unanimity. When the walls of Jericho fell before the host of Joshua the people shouted with one shout—a long, strong, united shout; no division into two or more parties; no doubt as to what they wanted; the whole army in absolute submission to the directions of their great captain. A similar united shout might perhaps bring down some walls of Jericho in our own days; and certainly, if there be any one or more points upon which Churchmen are at one, and concerning which they have the sympathy of all good men, whether Churchmen or not, it does seem incredible that they should be incapable of raising such a shout as should constrain ministers and members of Parliament to hear and give heed.

I take one example. It shall be the Archbishop of Canterbury's Patronage Bill. Here is a question fully ripe for legislation—almost hanging rotten on the tree. The question has been discussed by conferences and congresses, and Parliamentary committees, and Royal commissions; leading Nonconformists have sympathised with Churchmen on most points; every one agrees as to the chief things which ought to be done: and yet a Bill which was brought to the door of the House of Commons could find no entrance. Surely a united shout might at least open that door. It is not the question of a party, or the crotchet of a few eccentric Churchmen, but it is a matter in which the credit of the whole country is concerned, a matter which directly or indirectly affects us all. Oh, for unity of purpose amongst ourselves! Oh, for leaders of faith and courage! Oh, for power to hear and obey the voice of God, crying out now as it did to His chosen people's leader in ancient days, "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee!"

I venture to lay stress upon a point of this kind, because I regard it as just one of those practical points upon which at a Church Congress stress may be advantageously laid. I am sure that we—I mean the whole Church of England—need more unity of purpose and boldness and determination in making our voices heard and our wishes known; and I feel certain that if we did speak with unity and firmness we should compel attention. I am not at all dealing with the question whether it is desirable that we should have so much to do with Parliament, whether Parliament as now constituted is a suitable body to deal with religious questions, or whether there is any probability of a change in such matters; my only point is that while things are as they are, and while certain reforms which all good, not to say rational, men require cannot be had without application to Parliament, we should take care that Parliament and individual members of Parliament know what is desired and have a unanimous and clear intimation of the same. Let Churchmen be modest, gentle, reasonable; but let them be sure that "God is with them," and therefore "strong and of a good courage."

I would not have the Church of England always shouting, or always imagining that there are walls of Jericho before her that need to be thrown down. No, there is much to be done which needs no excitement, no shouting, no political combination, no dealing with Parliaments. The programme of your Congress, which speaks of the "Adaptation of Spiritual Agencies to Modern Needs," of the "Priesthood of the Laity," of the "Elasticity of Worship," which directs our thoughts to the work of Christ in foreign lands, to the devotional life of the Church at home, and which suggests the possibility and the importance of bringing the influence of the Church to bear upon the hearts and lives of working men—the programme of your Congress indicates the grand field of work which lies open to us, though the doors of the House of Commons should continue closed. Pardon me if I have even for a moment diverted your minds from this grand and most blessed field—the field in which God has appointed to each one of us his own special work, and concerning which He will require an account when the evening comes.

◆

RATIONAL PRAYER.

By Rev. ALFRED PEARSON, M.A.

Preached in All Saints Church, Nottingham, September 25th, 1887.

"O Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come."—Psalm lxv. 2.

THE preacher of to-day will hardly be acquitting himself fully of his sacred task if he always takes for granted in his ministrations that every one of his hearers is grounded and settled in the faith, and is ever living in that calm unquestioning orthodoxy of which the creeds of the Church are the symbol and expression. Now and again he must step aside from the more evangelic province of his holy function to meet the doubter's doubt; and in doing so address himself rather to the head than to the heart. We hear sometimes a good deal of fervid declamation against pulpit addresses to the intellect, and seasonable enough such strictures are, if the addresses attacked be the provision of a mere intellectual repast. But I take it that if the head runs away with the heart, and not the heart with the head; in other words, if a brother be troubled with a purely intellectual difficulty, one which is not begotten of moral obliquity (as not seldom is the case, be it remembered), then we must recover the stolen article by trying to catch the thief. If the mischief be not with the heart, what is the use of appealing to the heart? The part that is whole has no need of the physician; but that which is sick: "The whole head is sick and (as a consequence) the whole heart faint." This morning I purpose dealing, very inadequately, of course, in the allotted space, with the subject of prayer; not in the way of enforcing the duty of it, or enlarging on the privilege of it; but in order to urge its reasonableness, and to endeavour to confirm your own minds and my own in the blessed truth of its efficacy.

The plain question before us is this. How does God answer prayer? What are commonly called scripture proofs will be avoided; likewise experimental ones. It would be easy enough to bring together any number of instances in the career of God's people, to substantiate the distinct assurances in Holy Writ that God does, as the text asserts, hear and answer believing prayer. But another line is purposely selected, in the conviction that such an argument inevitably leaves behind it in many reflecting minds a residuum of doubt. Still the anxious question obtrudes itself. But how can it be? How does prayer operate? What is the field of its operation?

In the first place you are asked to consider for a moment the strange effects of the ceasing of every kind of prayer. The prayer of the Christian to his God is but the highest expression of human need—need which finds utterance in many lower than it, and indeed has its corresponding language in creatures below man in the scale of being; in the cry of bird and beast for the food proper to them. "The lions roaring after their prey do seek their meat from *God.*" "Who provideth for the raven his food, when his young ones *cry unto God?*" The cry of the bird and of the brute is here distinctly accepted as an appeal, irrational it is true, to the Creator, which is recognised as such by Him and acknowledged. That it is irrational, mere instinct—is something to our present purpose. For being such it will be conceded by the opponents of rational prayer to God, as an outcome of the law of the nature of these creatures. It is a cry for something which does not come mechanically within their reach. And it is as much a part of their nature to go in search of it as it is to discriminate between proper and improper articles of food when both are set before them.

To pass from the lower creatures to ourselves, the cry of infancy is only another instance of this appeal to have its needs supplied by another. Here, as there, the cry is the expression of a want. And without this announcement, there is nothing in the working of the so-called laws of nature (if we take those laws to *exclude* the workings of *will*), to advertise the want as a preliminary to its being supplied.

Now suppose all these lower kinds of prayer hushed; that no creature's wants be henceforth published; that none search for sustenance, all yielding themselves to the blind mechanism of nature for their supplies; that no flower turns to the sun for light, no infant's sob apprises the wakeful mother the tiny life calls for nourishment, it requires little imagination to transform this picture of a prayerless universe into a dead one. Not only is "prayer the Christian's vital breath," but we may say as much of it in a lower sense of all life. Regarded as an appeal by a creature, be it plant or animal, from its immediate surroundings to what is distant and unseen, we hear its voice throughout earth's manifold being. "There is no speech nor language where its voice is not heard."

But the question presses, "What of the reign of law?" How can prayer disturb this reign? What, suffer me to ask in reply, of *this* part of the reign of law which we have been considering; this universal appeal, what right have you to exclude it? And if you are forced to include it (and it is difficult to see how you can help including it), what right have you to include the lower types of prayer and reject the higher? If the cry of the child in the ear of its parent be regulated by a law of its being, why may not the cry of an immortal spirit to the God of Spirits, be equally according to a law of its spiritual being; more especially, if in the one case the appeal is to a being who is supposed to be subject to the tyranny of these so-called laws, and in the other the appeal is to a Being, who being God, formed them and is therefore above them?

A word as to this bugbear, Natural Law. Our opponents make much of this. They tell us prayer is useless, for that our lives are governed as all earthly being is, by fixed laws, which we can no more control than push a planet from its orbit into space. Now consider, what do we mean by these fixed laws? Let an illustration fetched from the field of common-place human action help us to an answer. Here is a man who daily walks to his business down a certain street at a certain hour. He is a punctual man, a methodical. He never misses for years; with the regularity of clockwork he passes a certain corner at 9 o'clock each morning. Now there are two very different things behind the man's methodical action. His character—that is the first, and his watch. Two motive-forces, one moral, the other purely mechanical. The watch is a piece of clever machinery, and he never fails, because it happens to be a good one. So that it is perfectly true to say, that his movements are regulated by the mechanical laws on which that useful handful of tiny mechanism is formed. But it is equally true that his movements depend upon his own personal will. For apart from an exercise of that will, his trusty lever would be powerless to guide his steps to that street corner at a fixed hour each morning. We will now suppose an urgent cause arises for diverging from his usual route. A friend, let us say, is dangerously ill in another street, and sends one evening to crave a few moments interview from him on his way to his office in the morning. But the messenger to whom the request is committed reasons thus: "It is little use my putting this request. This sick man's friend is a mere puppet in the power of his own watch. His morning's walk to business is regulated by the fixed unalterable laws of mechanics, represented by his own watch. To expect to be able to disturb these laws is presumptuous folly. It is no use my begging him to make an exception to-morrow morning to his custom; for that custom is only another name for a tyrannous necessity to which he is bound in helpless thraldom. My errand is useless." This *reductio ad absurdum* may well provoke a smile from the most sedate. Where, however, is it inapplicable to the argument before us?

Behind these mechanical laws lies the character, the will of the Eternal Source of all law; just as behind the watch-pocket of the man of method, lay the beating heart that voluntarily surrendered itself to the mechanical guide which it enclosed. To tell me that I may not appeal to the great loving heart of Him who sits behind nature, is to drag Him from His throne and set up in His stead a poor hand-and-foot-bound thrall. If Thou, O God, hearest not, nor canst answer prayer, then Thou art not only no longer God, but man rises above Thee and is Thy superior; himself the master of those forces by which Thou art enslaved.

Is this too strong a statement of nature's subserviency to man? We think not. Is it stronger than the statement of his Maker concerning him when He created him? "Let him have dominion over all the earth." This was man's primeval heritage. And though much of this divinely invested power has been lost to him through his fall, not a little is left. His body is endowed with powers of overriding and subduing natural laws. He conquers one grand law, whenever he raises his foot from the ground, or his hand from his side. His mind has been gifted with power of invention, analysis, combination, whereby he actually takes hold of some laws, and makes them assist him in triumphing over others. In the advancement of science and the arts of life, this struggle with natural laws is seen to be increasingly successful from age to age.

All this assertiveness of independent personality in man is remarkable enough. Its exhibition constrains us to the belief that his present position is not his natural one; that somehow his surroundings are out of gear; but that, wreck even as he is of what he once was, he still retains enough of former power to remind him of the empire he once possessed, when in perfect union with Him whose dominion over nature is complete.

In what has hitherto been offered on this momentous subject the preacher is only too well aware he may have been laying himself open to the charge of addressing himself to some, while being perhaps only partially intelligible to others. He began by preparing his hearers for this. The intellectual difficulties in the way of a hearty acceptance of the truth of the efficacy of prayer he has been chiefly anxious to meet. In what follows he will endeavour to be simpler.

For four-and-forty years Brownlow North was a wild, godless man. Some years before his conversion, which took place in 1854, he was seated at dinner one day beside the pious Duchess of Gordon. Something, perhaps, in their conversation led him to put the question; but he suddenly turned to her and asked, "Duchess, what should a man do who has often prayed to God and never been answered?" The lady, Nehemiah-wise, lifted her own heart to Brownlow North's silent God for guidance ere she replied. Then looking him quietly in the face she said, in a low tone, "Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts." North's countenance changed; he was much moved; and for the rest of the evening was very quiet. On leaving he thanked Lady Gordon. For fifteen long years Brownlow North's God was mute. "There was neither voice, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded." Then the erring soul became articulate, and so did God. His voice was heard, and the sceptic became the fervent evangelist. "O Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come."

Not all prayer is heard: only righteous prayer. "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." This does not mean a morally perfect man. The word is "*just.*" The "ground of an honest and good heart" is that from which this fair fruit springs. "If I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear me." Reconciliation with God, wrought through the effectual work of the Divine Spirit in the soul, is the indispensable pre-requisite of availing prayer. Prayer without this is like the telegraph wire without the electric current. There is the outward instrumentality, but no quick current pulsing along it. The essence of prayer is this spiritual magnetism. No message can knock at heaven's gate without it.

This should carefully be borne in mind in connection with prayer in temporal matters. Say a person goes to God in deep trouble and asks for relief. No relief perhaps comes in answer; and the person's faith in prayer is rudely shaken. But what if the petitioner has not sought *first* the kingdom of God and His righteousness, has he in this case any claim to plead the promise made conditionally upon this, that "all these things shall be added to him?" God does not pledge Himself to hear the prayers of an unreconciled soul. In the first lisping accents of our spiritual infancy we must learn to call God "Abba, Father," by "the Spirit of adoption"; then, for the first time, the heavenly and the earthly meet in our experience. The communication with the unseen world is opened. Being admitted to sonship our Father deals with us as with sons. His people's names are graven in the palms of His hands as a guarantee that all He does shall be done in love, and work their highest weal. We are put in harmony with that spiritual world which is above the natural, and is itself only the unseen part of that which *we* call the natural. Prayer then becomes as truly natural to the new-born spirit as the cry to the new-born infant; and the one can no more be abortive than the other.

Forget not that the promises appended to prayer are made to hang on the condition of absolute sincerity in the worshipper: "By sincerity," writes the late Professor Green, "is to be understood perfect openness towards God; that clearness of the soul in which nothing interferes with its penetration by the Divine sunlight. Given this openness on our part Christ, the revealed God, will gradually find His way into our souls, not in word, but in power. We must be clear from vice, clear from self-indulgence, clear from self-conceit. How imperfectly do we attain this clearness, yet how can we wonder, till we attain it, that we lack the witness of God. It is still our sins and nothing else that separate us from God. His witness grows with time. In great books and great examples, in the gathering fulness of spiritual utterance which we trace through the history of literature, in the self-denying love which we have known from the cradle, in the moralising influence of civil life, in the closer fellowship of the Christian Society, in the sacramental ordinances which represent that fellowship, in common worship, in the message of the preachers through which, amid diversity of stammering tongues, one spirit still speaks, here God's sunshine is shed abroad without us. If it reach not within the heart, it is because the heart has a darkness of its own, some unconquered selfishness which prevents its relation to Him being one of sincerity and truth."

That the efficacy of prayer is not so patent as to force itself upon the convictions of the worldly and the time-wedded is not matter for regret, but for thankfulness. This priceless power, which transfigures earth-bound Jacobs into Israels, Princes with God, giving them power with God and with men to prevail, is no common thing to be wielded by any, however unworthy, at their own fickle will. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him."

Once the Lord Jesus Christ broke the thread of His own discourse to the people by an ejaculatory prayer—"Father, glorify Thy name." Instantly—the spirit of sonship in His case being perfect—came the answer, "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again." But mark the effect upon the bystanders of this audible testimony to the efficacy of prayer. The people that stood by and heard it said that it thundered; others said, "An angel spake to Him." Both surmises were wrong. One section of the listeners heard nothing more than the evidence of mere natural forces; others, rising higher than they, thought they discerned something of the supernatural—the voice of an angel. It was reserved to the Son's pure soul to hear the voice of the Father. The voice was one; but how different the ears that caught it.

And just in proportion as we imbibe the spirit of the Incarnate Son shall we enjoy proofs of the efficacy of this wondrous power which it is the prerogative of sonship to wield. Christ's dominion over nature was complete because His union with the God of Nature was complete. His very miracles were the natural fruit of this perfect union.

This mighty weapon hangs in the armoury of God for your use and mine. But in order that we may take it down and handle it we must enter into fellowship with God. Mark that; and then this, that "the Christian on his knees often sees further than the philosopher upon tiptoe." Doubts born of estrangement from God will vanish in the light and peace of communion.

◆

THE Vice-Chancellor has given notice that the election to the Hulsean Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge, vacant by the election of Dr. Hort to the Lady Margaret Professorship, will take place on Saturday, November 19th. The Professor must be thirty years of age or upwards, in holy orders, and a Master of Arts, or of some higher degree in the University of Cambridge. He is required to print and publish at least six lectures in the course of every six years. The electors are the Vice-Chancellor, the Master of Trinity, Dr. Kennedy, Professor of Greek, the Regius Professor of Divinity, the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and the Norrisian Professor of Divinity.

THE death of Professor Gandell creates a vacancy in the Laudian Professorship of Arabic at Oxford. The new Professor will occupy the chair under new conditions and with new duties. Under the new statutes framed by the Commissioners, it is provided that "he shall lecture and give instruction on the Arabic, Syriac, and Chaldee languages and literature." That "the Professor is to be entitled to the emoluments derived from the benefaction of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, and assigned to the Professorship, and to the additional emoluments which are appropriated to it by the statutes of St. John's." "The Professor shall be elected by a board of electors, of whom one shall always be the President of St. John's." The board, as at present constituted, consists of the Secretary of State for India, the President of St. John's, the Regius Professor of Hebrew, the Boden Professor of Sanskrit, Bodley's Librarian. The names of Mr. Neubauer, Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian and reader in Rabbinical Literature, and of Mr. Margoliouth, Fellow of New College, are mentioned as candidates; both gentlemen are well known as distinguished Arabic scholars.

RHEUMATISM, GOUT,
SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, INDIGESTION, CONSTIPATION, LIVER & KIDNEY COMPLAINTS, NERVOUS DISORDERS, LADIES' AILMENTS, ETC. Promptly Relieved and CURED BY
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT
ALL sufferers should read "Harness' Guide to Health," free by post, containing copies of **Thousands of Testimonials.** Every man and woman in search of **Health, Strength,** and **Energy,** should at once send a **21s.** postal order to the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.** **52, OXFORD ST.** LONDON, W. and procure one of these famous Belts, and they may rely upon being CURED
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1887.

THE "DOWN-GRADE."

SOME little time ago there appeared in the *Sword and Trowel* a strongly-written article from the pen of Mr. Spurgeon, in which he condemned, in his own rough and vigorous manner, the teaching of many modern Nonconformists. If what is there stated be true, it would seem that there is a great defect in the teaching of many of the Baptist ministers. The efficacy of prayer is lost sight of; the inspiration of Holy Scripture is treated lightly; and there is in general a complete decay and a falling away from the ancient faith of those who boasted of their once Scriptural simplicity. And at the same time the writer speaks of the power and activity of the Established Church. The whole of the article is most painful reading, especially when we place side by side the teaching of the many agnostics of the present day. We were told only the other day, by one who professed to know the feeling of men at the present time, that the bulk of men, and especially the young men of the present day, care nothing for creeds, the one standard being the Ten Commandments. Mr. Spurgeon seems to consider that the cause of this down-grade, as he terms it, is mainly owing to the teachings of modern thought, which has taken the place of the old-fashioned truths, while others aver that it is the reactionary result of the teaching of ultra-Calvinism. But we think that there is another and far deeper cause, and that is the absence of any creed, or of any dogmatic teaching among a certain portion of the Nonconformists, for it is clear, when there is the embodiment of faith as preserved in the Apostles' Creed, and also in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, that *in them* is the great sheet anchor of Faith.

Further, this "down-grade" which is bewailed in the columns of the *Sword and Trowel*, seems to show that history always repeats itself. It is a well-known fact that the English Congregationalism of the eighteenth century resulted in Socinianism, and buildings which were originally erected for the worship of the Independent or Congregational body, are now in the hands of Unitarian congregations, while in a certain manufacturing town it is a fact that six of the ministers of a certain Unitarian chapel were originally either ministers of either the Baptist or Congregational body; and to come to more recent times, the respected minister of a Congregationalist chapel in a Midland town has become the minister of a large and influential Unitarian chapel in a large town some forty miles distant, so that, while it may be asserted by a leading gentleman* at the meeting of the Congregational Union, "that there was no foundation among Congregationalists for the charge of being on the 'down-grade,'" yet in the face of such testimony as we have mentioned the statement must be taken *cum grano salis.* At all events Mr. Spurgeon, whom we have always regarded as one of the most earnest, honest, and high-minded of religious teachers, says that there is a distinct disregard amongst the members of the Baptist Union of the lessons taught by the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, and of the monitions of the Holy Spirit.

But while we deplore that this should be the case, it rather throws into the shade the statements which are constantly being made, viz, that Churchmen are bound hand and foot by the chains of the Establishment, for whatever be the flaws in our present ecclesiastical system, yet, thank God! it cannot be asserted with any degree of truth, that the Church of England, or any portion of her clergy, are letting slip their hold on the great verities of the faith; rather does she hold to "the faith once delivered to the saints," with greater tenacity than ever; and that she is alive to the necessity of solving the great problems of the day may be proved by reference to the debates at the recent Church Congress. At the same time, the revelation that Mr. Spurgeon has made makes us feel that we must hold fast to "the form of sound words," and also hold fast to the faith in the history as given in the three Creeds, and in the teachings of the Church, maintaining the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, for *dogmatic teaching is at once the stay and support of the English Church.* When we look back into the page of history, and see how others have fallen from the faith, when we look across at Geneva, the home of Calvin, and the great centre of the teaching of John Knox, and note the testimony of travellers, that it is now the hot bed of Rationalism, and then look at our own Church, and see that amid all the controversy about Baptismal Regeneration, and the questions of ritual, vestments, etc., she has maintained the faith in all its purity, it reveals again the necessity for maintaining at any cost the hold on definite objective and historical truths.

---

* Mr. Guinness Rogers.

We do not condemn all modern thought—far from it—nay, the more the ministers of the Church live in the world, and keep themselves abreast of the questions of the time, the better will it be for them. But this need not mean that men are to give up the old teachings, rather should they see what is new, and where it is in accordance with God's Word and revealed religion, incorporate it into their teaching. The fault would seem to be that men have jumped at the conclusions which some have arrived at, without seeing clearly whether it is in direct accordance with the word of God. There is nothing new under the sun, and it is for the Church to teach all that is good, all that is useful, and yet not to lose sight of the great verities of the Faith.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE IRISH CHURCH CATECHISM.

SIR,—In order that such of your readers as are interested in the matter shall understand the truth, which your correspondent is unable or unwilling to tell, concerning the Preface to the Irish Prayer Book, and the Irish Catechism, I ask their attention to the following.

In 1870, a committee, called Master Brooke's Committee, was appointed "to consider whether . . . any measures can be suggested calculated to check the introduction and spread of novel doctrines and practices opposed to the principles of our Reformed Church." That committee, of twenty-six members, reported to the Synod in 1871, recommending, amongst other things, the new question and answer in the catechism which were at a later time adopted. In their Report they say in two places that they regard the teaching of the catechism concerning the mean of reception of Christ's Body in the Eucharist as less full than the teaching of the 28th Article. This is an opinion that any person is likely candidly to hold, and there is nothing to show that the reporters held it otherwise than candidly; as they also expressed it candidly. The Report describes the new question and answer as taken from the Article, which is incorrect, because, although their matter is taken from it, the question itself is in logical sequence to the answer that precedes it, the answer alone being taken from the Article. This error, or misstatement, is however so very slight, and so little evident, that no notice was taken of it when the Report was presented to the Synod, that I remember. The Synod discharged Master Brooke's Committee, and took no action upon it. A committee was then appointed for the general revision of the Prayer Book, of fifty-two members, twenty-two of whom had been on Master Brooke's Committee. That, the Revision Committee, elaborated our present Prayer-book, and prepared the Preface. The Synod adopted the fruit of their labour, as it now stands.

Your correspondent, in his account of these things, bears false witness in more than one point. It is false to say that the Report made any attempt to throw dust in people's eyes; and it is false to say that the Report and the Preface were adopted and sanctioned by the same men, with very few exceptions. Common honesty does not require that the language of the Preface should be interpreted from the language of the Report. Common honesty and common sense require that when two parties make use of different terms in describing a thing, they shall be understood as not meaning the same by their differing descriptions. It is worth mentioning that while the Revision Committee were responsible for the Preface, it was the composition of the then Bishop of Killaloe, Dr. Fitzgerald, who understood as well as any man, then or now living, truth and the English language, and the use of commas, and reason.

Your correspondent, not satisfied with his other falsehoods, must take the opportunity of writing to you to bring an abominable charge against the majority of the Synod. He tells you that the Broad Church people sold the Baptismal Service to the Low, and the Low sold the doctrine of the Incarnation to the Broad. This is worse than merely impudent; it is detestable. On the 20th of August he said that there stands in our Preface an absolute falsehood; in his letter in last week's PULPIT it is a misstatement. Will he dare to repeat that the Preface contains a falsehood?

I should add, that the discussion in the Synod on the use of a comma, at which I was present, was not concerning anything in the Preface; I say in my letter of the 8th ult. that I do not remember the occasion.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

November 1st, 1887.

SIR,—I have carefully read the correspondence between Mr. Lawrence and Canon Crosthwaite, and can safely give my testimony that the Canon is right in his interpretation of the entire question, both as to the facts of the case, the theological positions involved, as well as the inferences to be drawn from both. However well meant, the letters of Mr. Lawrence are incorrect and illogical, and do no good to the cause he comes forward to champion. The heat he exhibits does not make his aim clear or his blows straight. I have a perfect recollection of the whole controversy in Master Brooke's report, and in the debates of the Synod at which I was present, and much interested. My impression both then and since and now is this—that Rationalist treatment did more harm than good when applied to our Prayer-book.

A MEMBER OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.

SIR,—I see no use whatever in the controversy in your correspondence columns about the new question and answer added to the Catechism in the Irish Prayer-book, but I should like your English readers to have the subject properly before their eyes.

The words in the new Preface are: "As concerning the Holy Communion . . . we have made no other change than to add to the Catechism one question, with an answer taken out of the 28th of the said Articles."

The new question and answer are: "After what manner are the Body and Blood of Christ taken and received in the Lord's Supper?" "Only after a heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby they are taken and received is faith."

The words of the Article are: "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."

Is there any difference of meaning between the words of the Article and those of the new question and answer? I can see none.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, November 1st, 1887.

SIR,— Mr. Lawrence seems to misunderstand me. What I said, and say, is that our Revision Committee wanted to get rid of bread and priest, as ordinarily necessary in order to due reception. They might still be used, but not as ordinarily necessary. The reference to the Rubric in the Communion of the Sick establishes this. If Mr. Lawrence requires me to show that what our Revision Committee wanted to prove was that faith is the only mean necessary, not only in the case of the Rubric referred to, but generally, I will do so in another letter.

2. He makes a difference between "vehicle" and "mean," but I cannot perceive it.

3. He seems to say that nothing that I can prove as to *animus* of Synod, or Revision Committee, will touch the meaning and intent of new question and answer. This might be so, if those who drew up Preface were different men from those who drew up Revision Report. But being the same, the case is different. It is incredible that the men who said that they would derive a question and answer from the article, did not so derive them, or pretend so to derive them, seeing that they gave the very same question and answer which in the Report they, the very same men, said that they would so derive.

EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.

P.S.—Mr. Lawrence doubts that it was meant by the new question and answer, to make out that priest and elements are unnecessary. But the Report says that it was for that purpose that they are introduced, pp. 12 and 29, At pp. 92, 93 it says plainly that all the priest gives is the bread; and that the grace, called our Lord's Body, comes straight from Heaven, without intervention of priest and bread. As Mr. Lawrence asserts the priest's sacrificial capacity, I wonder he is blind as to the *animus* of the writers, the same, of Report and Preface. Of course, when I said that bread is made unnecessary, I meant the same, as to the wine. Mr. Lawrence seems to think that what I said was, that the writers of Report and Preface wanted to abolish totally priest as agent, and bread as a mean or vehicle. Not so, but that they wanted to make them unnecessary *addenda*, quoting Rubric in Communion for Sick, forgetting that same is to be found in Sarum Missal.

◆

PROXIMUS ARDET.

SIR,—Old Virgil teaches us that, when the next house is on fire, it is high time to look after our own. So we told the *Church Times* when it was singing "Io Triumphe!" over the spoiling of the Irish Church. "Be assured," we said, "the turn of the Welsh Church will come. The same arguments that prevail in the one case will prevail in the other, '*nomine mutato*,' as Horace says." Our words have already come true. The G. O. M. has laid his sacrilegious hands on another Church now. "*Vires acquirit eundo.*"

2. What were the Church spoiler's arguments? First, there was his bundle of historic lies, that England set us up for a purpose neglected. *Ergo*, that we should come down. As every one now knows, England found us here. As there was then no other Church in the country, we could not have been set up for its reformation. When a Romish Church *was* set up, we tried to enlighten it, and therefore Rome urged Mr. Gladstone on to plunder and destroy us. How would Mr. Gladstone like it, if the same lies were tried against himself? If the Queen and Lord Salisbury were now to take action against him, as a rebel, an opposer of law and the police authorities; let us suppose this. The plea might run thus, setting all truth at defiance, *more* W. E. G.:—The Hawarden estate was given to you, that you might loyally serve the Queen and the law. You have become a rebel, therefore Hawarden is forfeited. This is exactly his argument against the Irish Church. It was applauded by the *Church Times*, and alas! by High Churchmen in England. But now let us look at the similarity between the cases of the Welsh and Irish Churches. The *Church Times* is wringing its hands now over the Welsh case, as it once rang bells over ours.

3. The Irish Church had lost the population—down with it! But so has the Welsh. Why not say down with it also? Again, the Welsh Church is low and evangelical. This was another reason why the Ritualists in England, aye, alas! and in Ireland, too, rejoiced in our fall. We fondly hoped, when the G. O. M. took the axe in hand, that our being evangelical and anti-Ritualistic would have gained us favour or mercy with English Dissenters. But we hoped in vain! The Radical Dissenters were for the destruction of every establishment and endowed Church. So they joined the Ritualists and Mr. Gladstone against us. The Welsh Church is as evangelical as we were. Well, it may be said, it may reform—nay, it has so already. But are we not in Ireland reforming also? Why could not the *Church Times* have seen this? We were mending our ways full forty years before the axe fell on us. Why could not the *Church Times* have had patience with us? The G. O. M. had cast his glamour over the High Church party in England. Now retribution has come. "For thy violence against thy brother Jacob, shame shall cover thee, &c." (Obadiah 10-15).

4. Mr. Gladstone is hallooing on his myrmidons against the Scotch Establishment, as well as against the Welsh Church. I regard the property of the Scotch Establishment merely as I would the funds of the Methodist, or any other religious body. Their property has been devoted to God. It should not be cast into the public treasury. If taken from Presbyterians, it should surely go back to the Episcopal Church of Scotland, from which, under William III., it was taken. But the G. O. M. has no such notions. It shall go into the treasury, and so relieve taxation. This is his bribe, to buy over recruits in Scotland and Wales to his Irish Home Rule and rebellion schemes.

5. Let the *Church Times* fight away in behalf of the Welsh Church, and of the English, whose turn

will come next. We wish it every success, though it did "rejoice over the children of Judah, in the day of their destruction" (Obadiah 12). Let it use all its arguments, though it set them at nought, when used by us "in the day of our calamity." But if, reparation being hopeless, confession and repentance are necessary in order to pardon, I would counsel it to begin by unsaying all it said against us. We were never set up, or endowed, by England—our portion was God's portion. Nothing can excuse sacrilegious plunder. Our loss of the people was no excuse, nor our Low Church no excuse for robbing God. Let the *Church Times* and its Ritualistic party thus repent in sackcloth and ashes. Thus may God be moved to spare the Welsh Church and the English Church, when the great woodman turns his cruel axe upon each of them—which he will do when he has raised against them the infidel clamour which he is now trying to excite.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES." The Second Book of the Kings. By Rev. J. Rawson Lumby, D.D. Cambridge University Press.

THIS is a very good number of the Cambridge Bible Series. We are still of the same opinion we have expressed before, that the series contains too much scholarship for schools, and not enough for theological students; but we are not wishful to harp again upon that string with so good a book as this before us. The introduction is very well done. A student desiring, either for examinations or otherwise, to get a good summary of the principal facts relating to the text, the canonicity, the date, the authorship, and the contents of the Books of Kings, will find all the information he can require, and a great deal more, given clearly and concisely by Prof. Lumby. The same text is again followed which has been used throughout the series—Dr. Scrivener's Cambridge Paragraph Bible; and in the notes, difficulties are explained fairly and clearly, without the introduction of needless opinions or short-lived German theories. Sometimes Dr. Lumby gets out of the depth of the average schoolboy; even Lord Macaulay's schoolboy did not know Hebrew, and once or twice we venture to disagree. We will give one place where the note seems inadequate, and one place where Dr. Lumby has neglected an explanation of a difficulty in the text. First, we will take Dr. Lumby's note on Elisha's permission to Naaman to bow his head in the House of Rimmon. "We must judge both Naaman and the prophet according to the times in which they lived," says Dr. Lumby. But does not this miss the point? Naaman did not want to be allowed to combine the worship of Rimmon with the worship of Jehovah, he only wanted to solve this difficulty. Might he, in his official capacity as Captain of the Host, attend the King in *his* official capacity? Elisha said he might, so should we. We allow the same thing in India, we give State protection to native worship, and rightly. Our own officials of course are not asked to join in such worship, but they are expected and required to protect it from insult. So in England, a policeman must, if required, keep order in any church or chapel. A conscientious Roman Catholic policeman sent to keep order in Westminster Abbey, if it were known the Socialists intended to come, might think the service a godless schism, but he must go for all that. He need not worship, but he must attend officially. Naaman wished to do nothing more, and Elisha was quite justified in allowing him to do so much.

Secondly, in 2 Kings xv. 10, Prof. Lumby hints at a difficulty in the text, and states the LXX. variations. Why not amend the text? Why not strike out the Aramaic, unusual, and almost ungrammatical קָבָל־עָם, and read בְּיִבְלְעָם, as suggested by Gratz. Then the verse translates quite naturally, "And Shallum the son of Jabesh conspired against him and smote him *in Ibleam*, and slew him and reigned in his stead." Professor Driver accepts this conjecture, and we think Prof. Lumby might have accepted it also.

WE have received from the warehouse of the Oxford and Cambridge University Press, three copies of new editions of the "Revised New Testament," and one of the "Holy Bible." We are much pleased that they are published at such a reduced price as to be within the reach of everybody who may wish to possess the Revised Versions. They are most valuable for comparison with our Authorised Version. This Revised Version in some texts is a kind of commentary, and a help to the better understanding of difficult and obscure passages. We think the binding and type admirable, considering the price at which these editions are sold. The "Nonpareil New Testament" is particularly excellent in binding, paper and type. The Revised Version of the New Testament can now be obtained for 6d., and the Revised Bible for 1s. 6d., per copy, instead of 1s. and 3s. 6d. respectively, which have been the lowest prices hitherto.

THE DEAN OF YORK ON CREMATION.—The Dean of York, Chairman of the Church of England Burial Reform Association, speaking at a meeting held at the Mansion House, York, under the presidency of the Lord Mayor, said that it was absurd to call cremation hostile to Christianity. If it were so, what could be said of the martyrs who were burned to death. Whether burning or burying was to be the practice of the future was a question for scientific men, who did not seem to have yet made up their minds. Their own duty as members of the Burial Reform Association was clear. On the one hand they must avoid the contempt of the body shown in huddling it with other bodies in the same grave. On the other hand they must guard against the worship of the body shown in preserving it in solid coffin and vault.

THE long-talked-of memorials in favour of admitting women to degrees at Cambridge have at last been put in wide circulation. One has been signed by a considerable number of more or less eminent persons, who have, however, no direct interest in Cambridge, and whose opinions are not, therefore, so likely to weigh very much with the Senate. The memorial from some members of the Senate to the council will be scrutinised with more care. A number of signatures have been secured by correspondence, and it is now being circulated in the hope that other names may be added. This is a usual course to pursue, but it may be doubted if any memorial on an important subject was sent round for signature with so few names of residents appended. Some of them are undoubtedly very good names: the Master of Emmanuel and the Master of Jesus are not likely to urge on an ill-considered proposal; Professors Kennedy, Liveing, and Macalister are much trusted in all University business, and Dr. Jackson and Mr. Neil, who have served on the Council of the Senate, are also in favour of the change; but the list of non-residents is exceedingly strong. It includes the names of the Bishops of Bath and Wells and Manchester, the Dean of Exeter, Archdeacon Emery, and other well-known clergy; Sir J. E. Gorst, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Sir George Trevelyan, Earl Spencer, Sir James Stirling, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, the Hon. George Denman, Mr. Lowther, M.P., and others. One of the signatories has been recently removed by death, as the memorialists have lost the support which was promised them by Dr. Thring.

THE clergy of the diocese of Bath and Wells will rejoice in the announcement made in the *Times* of Monday last, that the canonry at Wells, vacant by the death of Professor Gandell, has been conferred by the Bishop (Lord Arthur Hervey) on his examining chaplain, the rector of Weston-super-Mare. The Rev. George Buckle has been so many years (thirty-five) identified with the work of the diocese that he would have had probably the unanimous support of the clergy had the election rested with them. Mr. Buckle took his degree at Oxford in Easter term, 1842—First Class Mathematics and Second in Classics—at the same time with Bishop Temple, of Balliol; President Wayte, and the Right Hon. Mountague Bernard, of Trinity, who were also in First Classes. He was Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, 1843-1852; Public Examiner in 1846 and 1850. Cardinal Newman, Bishop Fraser, Dean Church, Arthur Hugh Clough, and Matthew Arnold were also Fellows of Oriel during these years. In 1852 Mr. Buckle succeeded to the college living of Twerton, and in 1868 was appointed Prebendary of Wells by the then Bishop, Lord Auckland; examining chaplain to Lord Arthur Hervey in 1872; and rector of Weston-super-Mare by the same Bishop in 1875.

FIFTEEN Foundation Scholarships, confined to the sons of clergymen, will be offered for competition at Marlborough on December 1st and 2nd.

ON Tuesday last Sir J. P Deane formally prorogued the Southern Convocation till the 1st of December.

ON Tuesday last the Rev. Philip Deedes, of St. Albans, was appointed secretary of Haileybury College, on the retirement of the Rev. Lewis Deedes, after twenty-five years' service.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. Edmund Edward, M.A., Rector of Porthkerry-cum-Barry, Glamorganshire; Honorary Canon of Fairwell in Llandaff Cathedral.

Bannister, Rev. A., Curate-in-Charge of the Chapel-of-Ease, Ledbury; Rector of Aston, and Vicar of Leinthall Starkes, Hereford.

Berkeley, Rev. Julian Campbell, Lecturer at Watford Parish Church.

Bury, Rev. Herbert, Vicar of St. Peter's, Stockport; Honorary Secretary of the Diocesan Church Building Society for the Macclesfield Archdeaconry.

Castleman, Rev. William Henry. M.A., Rector of Nuneham Courtenay, Oxon.

Cosens, Rev. Edward A., M.A., Curate of St. Barnabas's, Oxford; Vicar of the New District of St. Augustine's, Dudley.

Dale, Rev. Herbert John, M.A., Rector of Radclive-with-Chockmore, Bucks.

Dixon, Rev. John Holmes, M.A., formerly Rector of Linkenholt Hants; Rector of Binton, Warwickshire.

Ellam, Rev. John, Vicar of Herne Bay, Kent; Rector of Weston Turville, near Tring, Herts.

Evans, Rev. Arthur Fitzgerald, Vicar of Great Maplestead, Essex.

Farrer, Rev. F., M.A., Rector of Batsford; Rector of Bourton-on-the-Hill, Moreton-in-Marsh.

Ford, Rev. Edward, M.A., Principal of Hillside School, West Malvern; Rector of Exhall-with-Wixford, Warwickshire.

Goddard, Rev. Louis Ernest, B.A., Rector of Water Stratford, Bucks.

Herbert, Rev. Alfred, M.A., formerly Assistant-Master in King Alfred's School, Wantage; Rector of Shellingford, Berks.

Hill, Rev. J. E., Vicar of Welshpool, and Incumbent of Christ Church; Vicar of Montford, and Rector of Shrawardine, Shrewsbury.

Hipkins, Rev. Charles, Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Newcastle.

James, Rev. T. N. Raymond, Rector of Luckington, near Chippenham.

Kirby, Rev. Richard Heighway, Vicar of Haverthwaite; Rural Dean of Cartmel-in-Furness.

Lane, Rev. E. A., Vicar of Haxey-with-Westwood, near Bawtry.

Large, Rev. James J., Vicar of Cutcombe-with-Luxborough, Somersetshire.

Maddison, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Blyth, Northumberland; Vicar of St. Augustine's, North Shields.

Malaher, Rev. W. E., Rector of Weston Turville; Vicar of Herne Bay, Kent.

Martyn, Rev. Thomas Waddon, M.A., Vicar of Aston Abbots, Bucks.

Mason, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Hockliffe, Bedfordshire.

Percival, Rev. Stanley E., Vicar of Merriott, near Crewkerne.

Salmon, Rev. R. J., Vicar of St. Martin's, Brighton; Rector of Barcombe, Sussex.

Tirebuck, Rev. T., Curate of St. Jude's, Birmingham; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Birmingham.

Warner, Rev. R. E., Rector of Snitterby; Prebendary of Dunholme in Lincoln Cathedral.

Whinerey, Rev. Robert, M.A., late Curate of Christ Church, Woburn Square, London; Vicar of Beoly, Worcestershire.

Whittuck, Rev. Charles Augustus, M.A., Rector of West Shefford, Berks.

Woods, Rev. John, Vicar of St. Mary-le-Gill with St. James's, Barnoldswick, near Colne.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Andrews, Rev. John Frederick, Rector of St. Mary's Steps, and late Chaplain in the Royal Navy, at Exeter, on the 26th ult., aged 30.

Armstrong, Rev. Alfred Thomas, Canon of Manchester, at Ashton-on-Ribble Vicarage, on the 25th ult., aged 82.

Gandell, Rev. Robert, M.A., of Holywell Lodge, Oxford, Laudian Professor of Arabic, and Canon of Wells, at Wells, on the 24th ult., aged 69.

Gooch, Rev. Frederic, D.C.L., formerly Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, and Rector of Baginton fifty-four years, at Baginton Rectory, on the 29th ult., aged 83.

Paddon, Rev. T. H., M.A., Incumbent of Immanuel Church, twenty-seven years Vicar of High Wycombe, Bucks, at 7, Sussex-gardens, Eastbourne, on the 30th ult., aged 80.

Parkinson, Rev. Richard M.A., at Fiddington Rectory, on the 25th ult,, aged 63.

Richards, Rev. John Williams, at Walton-by-Clevedon, Somerset, on the 30th ult., aged 76.

Walker, Rev. John Russell, Archdeacon of Chichester, at The Chantry, Chichester, suddenly, on the 30th ult., aged 50.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE HEBREW PROPHETS.'

By the Rev. Canon DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, October 16th, 1887.

"And I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazirites. Is it not even thus, O ye children of Israel? saith the Lord. But ye gave the Nazirites wine to drink; and commanded the prophets, saying, Prophesy not."—Amos ii. 11, 12.

THE Book of Amos, brief though it is, offers much to engage the reader's attention. With the doubtful exception of Joel, Amos is the earliest of the prophets whose writings are incorporated in the Old Testament canon. Himself a native of Judah, he receives a commission to preach in the northern kingdom; and appears at the royal sanctuary of Bethel, towards the end of the long reign of Jeroboam II., about 750 years before Christ. In the case of the earlier prophets, owing to the habit of the Hebrew historians to re-cast and amplify, in the sense of their own times, the sayings transmitted to them from an earlier age, it is often difficult to feel assured that the prophecies reported in the historical books are before us in their original colouring and dress; in the case of Amos, we have the witness of a contemporary, a keen and acute observer, furnishing us himself with a picture of the beliefs and institutions of his day, describing to us, directly or by allusion, the condition of life and society in Northern Israel, declaring, freely and unrestrainedly, the impression which they produced upon him, and the motives impelling him to pass judgment upon them. In the text, he alludes to two classes of God-directed men, one the Nazirites, men who by a life of abstinence protested against the sensuality and indulgence prevalent about them, and who, from the nature of the allusion, must have formed a conspicuous element in society; the other, the prophets. It is as giving us a personal record of the work, and aims, and convictions of a prophet at this early date, that the Book of Amos acquires peculiar interest. Thus the authority which a prophet of that day claimed is expressed by him in the memorable words:—"Surely the Lord Jehovah will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret to His servants the prophets. The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord Jehovah hath spoken, who can but prophesy?" (iii. 8.) The prophet came forward as the spokesman and representative of his God; and the impulse prompting him to deliver the message which he had received was an irresistible one. Hosea, the younger contemporary of Amos, speaks of the prophet in similar terms. Thus alluding both to the prominent position which they took, and to their authority, he writes:—"I have also spoken unto the prophets, and I have multiplied visions, and by the hand of the prophets have used similitudes." And just as Amos in the text implies that their preaching was apt to be unpalatable to the people, so Hosea alludes to the resentment which his own observation had shown him that it provoked: "As for the prophet, a fowler's snare is in all his ways, and enmity in the house of his God" (ix. 8).

The history of Israel, it has been said, is a history of prophecy. It is a history in which men of prophetic rank and name stand at the great turning points of the people's life and direct the movements. It is a history, further, in which the inner progress of the nation was largely determined by the prophets, who sustained or intensified the religious life of the community, and stood superior to their contemporaries, as the exponents and representatives of ethical and theological truth. I propose this morning to offer a few illustrations of their work in the two spheres of politics and morals. The insight and independence possessed by the prophets fitted them, in a singular degree, to be the political advisers of their nation. They were in closer sympathy than most of their fellow-countrymen with the needs of the time; they apprehended more quickly and accurately what the situation of the nation demanded; they saw beyond the seeming interests of the moment, and were regardless either of popular favour, or of interests of party. Surveying the nations around, the prophets descry in advance the tendencies and impulses hidden from ordinary eyes, and lay down the principles by which, as the course of history shapes itself, the welfare of their own nation demands that it should be guided. They denounce the popular statesmanship of the day, and expose the fallacies which underlie it. They attack the national sins and shortcomings, showing how they must inevitably work out their natural results, in a deterioration of national character and a growing inability to meet danger calmly. Amos sees society in the northern kingdom, in spite of the brilliancy and long prosperity of Jeroboam's reign, morally vitiated and corrupt. The nobles of Samaria, so far from evincing anxiety for the public weal, "put far the evil day," and are abandoned to self-indulgence and luxury (vi. 3-6); the heathen themselves are invited to testify to the violence and disorder prevalent in the capital (iii. 9); and each section of his prophecy ends with a dark vision of approaching disaster and misfortune. In the plaintive halting rhythm of the Hebrew elegiac, he sings :—

> The virgin of Israel is fallen ; she shall no more rise :
> She lieth forsaken upon her land ; there is none to raise her up (v. 2).

He speaks again, even more significantly and directly: "Behold, I raise up against you, O house of Israel, saith Jehovah, the God of hosts, a nation; and they shall afflict you from the entering in of Hamath unto the brook of the Arabah." The limits here indicated are exactly those to which, according to the history, the then reigning monarch had just successfully restored the dominion of Israel. The words of Amos were soon to be verified. Within sixteen years the inhabitants of the north-eastern districts were deported by Tiglath-Pileser to Assyria: within thirty years the northern kingdom had ceased to exist. The prophet had interpreted but too truly the signs of the times. He had seen in advance the formidable influence which Assyria was destined soon to exercise upon the fortunes of Palestine : he perceived how little fitted the political leaders of Samaria were to guide their state safely through the approaching crisis ; he set before them the course which there was hope might at least partially, if it was not too late, avert the ruin (vi. 15); but he saw, not the less clearly, what the final issue would be.

Other illustrations of the same faculty possessed by the prophets are not far to seek. The prophets who were popular with the people were those who, while finding nothing in their conduct to censure, held out to them visions of felicity and peace, to be realised in the immediate future, without any such antecedent period of discipline or probation as is always postulated by the canonical prophets. Such prophets are often alluded to, for instance, by Micah, Isaiah and Jeremiah: they are described as merely echoing the superficial sentiment of the masses, or as being "prophets of their own hearts." In Jeremiah's time, when the invader was at the door, they persistently promised peace ; and after the Chaldeans had carried away the vessels of the Temple to Babylon, they promised their restoration, and the return of the exiled King, Jehoiachin, "within two years" (Jer. xxviii. 3). Jeremiah's eye had seen more truly. Not only had he foreseen the ruin which the policy of the last kings of Judah was accelerating ; he foresaw, besides, in its true magnitude, the dimensions which the empire of Nebuchadnezzar was destined to attain. With an unfaltering hand, in bold and clear strokes, he constructs the future. No sooner had Nebuchadnezzar gained his victory over Pharaoh-Necho, in 604, than the prophet grasps the idea that the empire of the then known world is to be his : he greets the conqueror with the ode of triumph, preserved in chapter xlvi., promising him further successes ; he styles him "Jehovah's servant," and declares that the safety of Judah is to be found in submission to his sway. For seventy years the Chaldean supremacy should be maintained. At the end of that period, the exiled Jews should be visited and restored to their place (xxix. 10). The prophets, as is natural, accommodate their views to the changing movements which sway the political world. A century before, Isaiah had promised that the tide of Assyrian aggression should be rolled back from the rock of Zion, and leave the Jewish state, not indeed untouched by the fury of the waves, but still standing and secure. Now, Jeremiah saw that the hand of Nebuchadnezzar was destined to prevail, and taught that the safety of the city lay in its acceptance of the inevitable. He was persecuted by political opponents, he was charged with lack of patriotism and courage, but the issue showed that he had seen aright. Fifty or sixty years afterwards another crucial moment arrived in the history of the chosen people. Was Judah to lose its individuality in the land of its exile, to be gradually assimilated, like its brethern of the ten tribes, to the nations among whom it dwelt? Or was it to return to its ancient home and complete the destined course of its history? There were many who had followed the advice given by Jeremiah to the first exiles, they had settled down and found their ease in their adopted home. They were content to remain where they were ; they had no high aspirations for the future ; the magnificence of Babylonian idolatry overawed them ; the strength and resources of the proud imperial city were able, they felt assured, to repel every assailant. There was a prophet who saw otherwise—the author of the great series of discourses, which now form the last twenty-seven chapters of the Book of Isaiah. Did they deem it impossible that the power of the Chaldeans could be shaken? The prophet meets their doubts in the profound and pregnant words : "All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field. . . . . The grass withereth, the flower fadeth ; but the word of our God shall stand for ever." Did they point to the pomp and splendour of the Babylonian idols? He aims against them the keen shafts of irony and satire. Cyrus is Jehovah's appointed agent, and though his triumphal progress may throw the nations of Asia into consternation and drive them in terror to their idol-gods (xli. 2-7), Israel has no ground for fear: a noble and august future is still before it. Did they, still unconvinced, allege that the facts refuted the prophet's too sanguine view? He replies : "For my thoughts are not as your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith Jehovah :" your estimate of the facts is a false one ; the word spoken cannot be recalled ; and the joy with which, ere long, you will leave Babylon behind you, will be your involuntary attestation of its truth (lv. 8-12).

An attentive study of their writings shows that the prophets are primarily the teachers of their own generation. It is the political mistakes, the social abuses, the moral shortcomings of their own age which they set themselves to correct. To be sure, they assert principles which are of universal validity, and capable, therefore, of application in new and altered circumstances, but the special forms which these principles assume in their hands show that they have been deliberately adopted to meet the needs of their own time. Prophecy subserved moral purposes: and its primary scope was thus the practical guidance, in life and thought, of those amongst whom the prophet lived. This fact affords us a criterion for estimating the temporal predictions of the prophets. The predictive element in the prophets is not, perhaps, so great as is sometimes supposed. Not only do the prophets deal with their actual present much more largely than is popularly imagined to be the case, but even in their announcements relative to the future, the amount of exact and minute prediction is less, probably, than might antecedently be expected. The prophet's theme is developed with an artist's hand. He constructs a picture for the purpose of representing it in its completeness, and his genius supplies him with images of surprising beauty and force. But the imagery is merely the external dress in which the idea is clothed; and it is a vain and false literalism that would demand a place for its details in the fulfilment. There has been no highway such as Isaiah pictured for the return of the banished Israelites from Assyria (xi. 16); no pillar, or obelisk, reminds the traveller entering Egypt, that the country is devoted to the worship of the true God (xix. 19, 20): Sennacherib perished by the sword in his own land, and the vast funeral pyre which the same prophet conceived as prepared for him, and which he saw in imagination already kindled by Jehovah's breath (xxx. 33), is but the form under which he depicts the completeness of the Assyrians' ruin. So, again, Isaiah's sense of the weakness of Egyptian nationality, and its inability to resist any determined assailant, finds expression in a prophecy in which he expands this thought, and with a keen appreciation of national characteristics, applies it over the entire area of Egyptian civilisation. Their figures, therefore, as this example shows, though not to be understood too literally, are not idly chosen; they stand in a real relation to the thought to be expressed, and will be found, if properly studied, to be its suitable and adequate exponent. Other prophecies, again, relating to the future, are rather of the nature of solemn denunciation than prediction in the strict sense of the term; they indicate the issue to which a policy, or course of action, may naturally be expected to lead, without claiming to announce it categorically as a prediction. Other predictions, as is expressly taught by Jeremiah, are nullified by a change supervening in the moral situation: uttered conditionally, and on the basis of a particular combination of circumstances, when the circumstances alter, the issue, it is evident, may change also, and the prediction be thus no longer applicable. And of others, sometimes remarkably definite, we do not know whether they were fulfilled or not, as for example, Isaiah's declaration of the humiliation of Moab within three years, or of Kedar within one year, or of the banishment of Shebna.

But when the necessary deductions have been made upon grounds such as these, there remain undoubted and remarkable examples of true predictions; not, indeed, predictions relating to a remote future, without interest or significance for the prophet's own contemporaries, but predictions declaring the issue of a present political complication, or announcing beforehand a coming event, especially events having a bearing on the progress of the Kingdom of God. Instances of such prediction, verified within the limit of a few years, have been quoted already. Jeremiah's prophecy of the expiration of the Chaldean supremacy after seventy years, is no exception to this rule; the restoration which then followed was but the termination of the same phase of history, of which Jeremiah's contemporaries in 604 were witnessing the commencement. Two or three other examples may be worth referring to. One of the boldest, and also one of the clearest, is afforded by the Book of Isaiah. Isaiah, a year before the event, predicted, not the siege merely of Jerusalem by the Assyrian armies (which in our ignorance of the exact nature of the relation subsisting between the two countries might have been reached by political calculation), but the termination of the siege by a sudden and unexpected disaster dispersing the besieging forces. "Ah, Ariel, Ariel, the city where David encamped! add ye a year to the year, let the feasts run their round; then will I distress Ariel, and there shall be mourning and lamentation. And I will camp against thee round about, I will lay siege against thee with a fort, and I will raise siege works against thee. But the multitude of thy foes shall be like small dust, and the multitude of the terrible ones as the chaff that passeth away; and it shall be at an instant, suddenly" (xxix. 1-5). So different did the prospect appear to the people of the city, that they could attach no meaning to the prophet's words, and stared at him as he spoke in blank astonishment and incredulity. But Isaiah is confident, and does not shrink from repeating his assurances. The passage I have quoted is but the first of a series of utterances, in all of which he describes in different imagery a sudden and mysterious disaster, which will annihilate Judah's foes. Thus shortly afterwards we read, "As birds flying, so will Jehovah of Hosts protect Jerusalem; he will protect and deliver it; he will pass over and preserve it. And the Assyrian shall fall with the sword, not of man; and the sword, not of man, shall devour him; and he shall flee from the sword, and his young men shall be set to task-work." And, a little later, probably while the troops of Sennacherib were massing close at hand in the Philistine territory, "The nations rush like the rushing of many waters, but he shall rebuke them, and they shall flee afar off, and shall be chased as the chaff of the mountains before the wind, and like the whirling dust before the storm. At eventide behold confusion: before the morning he is not!" And, still later, when the last hope of escape seemed almost to have been cut off, and the fate of the city, to human eyes, must have appeared to be sealed, "At the noise of the tumult, the peoples are fled; at the lifting up of Thyself the nations are scattered." The vagueness or obscurity which sometimes appears to hang over the prophet's words, can often be removed, when it is possible to throw upon them the light of history. On a bas-relief now in the British Museum there is the representation of a warrior king seated upon his throne of state: around are seen chariots and armed attendants; in front there advances a train of crouching captives; an inscription above exhibits the words "Sennacherib, king of multitudes, king of Assyria, seated on a lofty throne, receives the spoil of the city of Lachish." A voice has risen out of the ruins of Kouyunjik to interpret the Hebrew prophet to this generation. Isaiah continues, apostrophising the enemy, "And your spoil shall be gathered as the caterpillar gathereth; as locusts leap, shall they leap upon it." The varying imagery which the prophet employs, warns us that we must, as before, be on our guard against undue literalism in interpretation; but the fundamental thought which throughout underlies it, is in entire agreement with the event; and whether it was a pestilence, or some other agency, that caused the destruction of the Assyrian host, its occurrence at the time required for the salvation of the city, was a coincidence beyond the reach of human prevision or calculation. Other instances, if not so brilliant, yet not less convincing, might readily be found. Damascus capitulated to Tiglath-Pileser, literally within the limits of time anticipated by Isaiah, (viii., 4), and the fall of Samaria was not postponed many years beyond it. It would have been particularly interesting to notice Jeremiah's announcement of the spot in Tahpanhes on which Nebuchadnezzar, upon entering Egypt, should erect his royal throne. Until recently, no independent evidence of an invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, was known to exist; but two inscriptions lately discovered now attest it, and cylinders inscribed with his name have been disinterred almost upon the very site indicated by Jeremiah.* An impartial criticism, while, on the one hand, owning that temporal predictions exist which have been apparently unfulfilled, and admitting the probability that in the case of such as refer to a distant future, they have been incorrectly dated, or not transmitted to us in their original form, will, on the other hand, frankly acknowledge such as are beyond reasonable doubt or suspicion, and will not seek to eliminate them, or minimize their significance, by special pleading.

Ethically, the prophets play the *rôle* of what we should term social reformers. They attack the abuses always conspicuous in an Eastern aristocracy; they assert with uncompromising persistency the claims of honesty, justice, philanthropy, and mercy. Certainly, the most ancient Hebrew legislation known to us, the Decalogue and Book of the Covenant, had placed such claims in the forefront; and the prophets do not, in this respect, so much advance theoretically as apply old principles to new situations, and re-assert them with fresh emphasis and energy. To purify justice, to reform religion, to fight against inconsistency, to redress social wrongs, are the aims common to all the prophets. Amos, introducing the main theme of his prophecy, shows both originality and breadth of view. Casting his eye upon the nations around, Damascus, Gaza, Tyre, Edom, Ammon, Moab, he fastens upon some act of cruelty or inhumanity of which each has been guilty, and declares the judgment impending upon it. Israel might listen thus far with equanimity: but the prophet ends by applying to the privileged nation the same standard:—"Thus saith Jehovah: For three transgressions of Israel, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof, because they sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for the sake of a pair of shoes; that pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor, and turn aside the way of the meek." What a picture do these few words suggest to us of society in the northern kingdom, 750 years before Christ, and of the faculty for capable and comprehensive criticism possessed by the herdman from Tekoa! Amos, the first of the canonical prophets, transcends the bounds of Jewish particularism: he never, it has been noticed, describes Jehovah as the God of Israel; he describes him as the "God of Hosts," which, whatever the origin of the phrase may be, becomes practically equivalent to the Omnipotent; and here he represents Him as meting out equal justice, alike to Israel and the Gentiles, not for the neglect of religious rites, not even for their adhesion to unspiritual service, but for their repudiation of the duties and offices imposed upon all by their common humanity. Amos' keen sense of justice appears again and again in the course of his prophecy. Thrice does Jehovah swear (iv. 2; vi. 8; viii. 7): and each time the oath is elicited by some deed of selfishness, or indifference, or dishonesty: "Hear this, ye that would swallow up the needy, and make the poor of the land to fail; saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat? making the ephah small and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit . . . Jehovah hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob: Surely I will never forget any of their works." And noting the inconsistency of elaborate religious observances conjoined with a disregard of the moral principles of which they should be the accompaniment and the expression, he exclaims, speaking still in Jehovah's name, "I hate, I reject your pilgrimages; and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment roll down as waters, and righteousness as an overflowing stream" (v. 21, 23, 24).

---

* See the "Academy," 1884, vol. xxv., p. 51.

In Isaiah, consistently with the more permanent and influential position enjoyed by the prophet in Jerusalem, the indictment is more detailed, and covers a wider area than is the case in Amos. His fifth chapter may be taken as a representative one. Opening with the parable of the vineyard, the prophet shows how, in spite of the advantages lavished profusely upon it, Israel has disappointed its owner, and not repaid the care bestowed upon it,—"He hoped for justice, but behold bloodshed; for righteousness, but behold a cry." And then one by one the national sins are summed up. The inordinate desire for the possession of large estates which now asserted itself, accompanied, no doubt, by the unfair or violent ejectment of less fortunate possessors; the immoderate indulgence in pleasures of the table, leaving, in the minds of many, no room for more serious thought; the devotion to sin for sin's sake, attended by a scoffing and defiant unbelief; the confusion of moral distinctions, blinding men to the true nature and issue of the course which they were pursuing; the self-satisfied astuteness of the leading politicians who were confident in the wisdom of their plans, and conceived that their management of the State was above criticism; the systematised corruption of the administrators of justice—these are the sins against which Isaiah hurls his denouncing "Woe," showing (verse 24) how in truth they were already working their natural effects in the disintegration of the national life, and the slow but steady deterioration of the national vigour. And if we read his book as a whole, we see how no class in the community is exempted from his censure. The men of wealth and influence, who ignored the responsibilities of office or position; the leaders of opinion, who possessed weight in the Government, or gave a tone to society; the advocates of a plausible but short-sighted policy, who possessed the art of securing the ear of the people; a powerful minister whose influence he perceived was operating to the jeopardy of the State; the masses whom he saw sunk in indifference or formalism; the King himself, whether it were Ahaz in his wilfulness and insincerity, or Hezekiah listening incautiously to the overtures of a foreign potentate—all in turn receive the prophet's bold and fearless rebuke. In Isaiah, we have an example of the prophet, upon a more conspicuous and broader platform than that of Amos, engaged in a lifelong conflict with the dominant tendencies of his age.

I have sought to illustrate under two aspects, the historical significance of the prophets. History, we see, elucidates the prophecy; prophecy interprets the history. If we would understand the prophecy rightly, we must throw ourselves back to the time at which it was uttered, and realise the social and political situation to which it was addressed. Then, in its turn, prophecy illumines, and even directs, the history. May the Spirit which quickened and exalted the genius of the prophets help us, as we read their writings, to take the lessons which they teach to ourselves! May He inspire us, if it be possible, with the same generous and disinterested impulses, the same lofty aspirations, the same admiration of nobility in thought and deed, the same honesty and love of truth!

* * *

THE Rev. W. Baker, head master of the Merchant Taylors' School, and chaplain to Sir Reginald Hanson during his year of office, preached the last of his series of sermons at St. Paul's, as Lord Mayor's chaplain, on the "Historic continuity of the Church of England." The subject of his Sunday morning's sermon was the "History of the liturgy of the Church." The service was attended by the Lord Mayor, who signalised the last Sunday as well as the first of his official career by attendance at the morning service, and occupied his accustomed stall in the choir, where each prebendal stall now contains a handsomely bound Prayer-book as his memorial of the Jubilee service at St. Paul's.

MR. G. ROWLEY HILL, son of the late Bishop of Sodor and Man, writes to the *Morning Post* that if his father had not been so suddenly called away a cathedral would, in all probability, have been consecrated this summer in the see of Man. "I may truly say (observes Mr. Hill) that one of the dearest wishes of my father's heart had been to restore the ancient cathedral to the see which I believe to be the oldest in the Church of England, it having been in ruins since the time of Bishop Wilson. The best authorities were consulted as to the advisability of restoring this ancient edifice, it being situated on a rocky island at the mouth of Peel Harbour. It was decided, however, after the subject had been duly considered, that it would be better to let it remain a picturesque ruin, and a monument of the earliest days of Christianity. Accordingly it was determined to erect a new edifice on the mainland, more suited to the requirements of the present day, and more easy of access. A church was commenced in 1879, and was only completed about three years ago, when it was ceremoniously opened by the Archbishop of York. The chief difficulty in making it a cathedral lay in the passing of a Bill through the Manx Legislature, and it was before the council at the time of my father's death. He was in hope that the Bill would pass, so that the Jubilee of 'The Lady of Man' might be marked by the restoration of a cathedral to the see. Had this been accomplished, I think, sir, you will see that the cathedral in the Isle of Man would have been the first built in the British Isles since the Reformation."

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
From Mrs. LAVANIA FOWLER, 2, New Pond Cottage, Romsey, Hants.
"It affords me great pleasure to state that your **ELECTROPATHIC BELT** has not only removed the pain I have so long suffered, but has been the means of so strengthening my **spine** as to prevent the recurrence of any difficulty I have had in breathing."
SPINAL WEAKNESS.
Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of the **Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,** should at once stop physicing, and remit 21s. for HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials POST FREE. **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1887.

PREACHING ORDERS.

ONE of the greatest problems of the present day seems to be, how to reach the masses, and so regain our hold upon them, and bring them back to the fold from which they have strayed. Various suggestions have been made, and various plans have been tried. Lay Helpers' Associations, College and Public School Missions, Parochial Missions, the Oxford House and the Toynbee Hall, the special work of the Church Army, and the Church of England Working Men's Society; and yet after all that has been done by these varied agencies, there still remains an enormous amount of sin and indifference, which must be grappled with. At the recent Church Congress, the question of the adaptation of spiritual agencies to modern needs was fully discussed, and among them the establishment of a Preaching Order was strongly insisted upon. There is much to be said in favour of this plan, but before it is thoroughly carried out there will be needed a great amount of care and discretion, or else the result will be, to a certain extent, a failure. In a modified form a Preaching Order has been established in the Church of England in the work of the Parochial Mission Society. Mr. Aitken, who is the head superintendent of that Society, has some half-dozen clergy working with him, who are free from all parochial cares, and who are prepared to hold missions whenever called upon to do so. There is also a diocesan missioner for Rochester, Lichfield, Salisbury, and Bath and Wells, while at the same time the dioceses of Durham, Winchester, and Truro has each its own Canon missioner, whose special work it is to direct and organise mission work in the diocese.

In the dioceses of Lincoln, Peterborough, and Salisbury there is a Society of Mission Clergy, so that it is evident that something is already being done in this direction, and according to the returns made to the Official Year Book, parochial missions were held in nearly every part of the country during the year 1886.

But while there may be an advantage in having a special order of mission preachers who shall do nothing else, there is a great danger of getting into stereotyped forms, and of judging things from an ideal, rather than from a practical point of view. And to be constantly preaching what are known as "rousing" sermons is likely, unless jealously guarded against, to become unreal and mechanical; and therefore on this ground we believe that it would be far better for the mission preacher to have some sphere of parochial work, no matter however small, because, if he has not, he is in danger of losing that touch with the people which parochial intercourse is likely to give him. The Society of Mission Clergy, in the diocese of Peterborough, is composed of members and associates, who are superintended by a warden, but are all, or nearly all, beneficed clergy in the diocese, who are willing to help in mission work, either as preachers, or assisting those who undertake to conduct the mission; and this plan we believe to be even better than having a Diocesan Missioner who does nothing else.

We believe that there is a great deal of latent power in the Church, which might well be called into action; we hear complaints as to the paucity of workers in large parishes, and the great difficulty in providing curates; and yet it may be that within a radius of a dozen miles, there are a number of clergy, who, as vicars or rectors of small parishes are languishing for want of work, and contact with the active minds and enterprising spirits which are to be found in our large towns. Why should not these men be utilised for diocesan purposes? Some could work in the larger centres during the week, or at fixed periods, while others, if possessed of the gifts and the powers, might undertake to conduct missions in certain places in the diocese, while others might lecture on Church History; all helping forward the work of the Church in one way or another. And we also believe that a great deal of the money that is spent in paying salaries to organising secretaries for the various societies in a diocese might be saved, if only the energy and strength of the Church were exerted, and that those who have the time would take up the work.

With regard to preaching orders, if it is deemed necessary to have such, we trust that there will be a provision that the members shall live at the cathedral city, or in some other central place, and not at pleasant sea-side or suburban places. The advantage will be to the men themselves, as a means of bringing them into contact with the world, and at the same time keeping alive the fire of spiritual life. The great thing in these days is, for the clergy, as teachers of men, to live in the world, to be fully cognisant of the ways and thoughts of men, and so to be able to deal with them. And, at the same time, by their power and spiritual insight, to lead men on to a higher level, and so to raise the spiritual tone.

MOHAMMEDANISM.

A Paper read at the Wolverhampton Church Congress, by the Rev. ISAAC TAYLOR, LL.D., D.Litt., Cambridge, Canon of York, Rector of Settrington, Yorkshire.

A painful task has been assigned to me. It is pleasant, amid the plaudits of a great audience, to proclaim the triumphs of the faith, but it is disheartening to tell the story of a lamentable failure. The rosewater physician who prescribes agreeable tonics is more acceptable than the stern surgeon whose diagnosis discloses a dangerous disease and the necessity of a painful operation.

But it is always best honestly to ascertain the truth, and boldly to face it; for we are confronted with the most staggering problem that can bewilder Christian men.

It must be confessed that over a large portion of the world, Islam, as a missionary religion, is more successful than Christianity. Not only are the Moslem converts from paganism more numerous than the Christian converts; but Christianity, in some regions, is actually receding before Islam, while attempts to proselytise Mohammedan nations are notoriously unsuccessful. We not only do not gain ground, but even fail to hold our own.

The faith of Islam already extends from Morocco to Java, from Zanzibar to China, and is spreading across Africa with giant strides. It stretches with an almost unbroken front from the Mediterranean nearly to the Equator, and it is swiftly advancing southwards. It has crossed the Sahara and taken possession of the great lakes and rivers. It is the religion of Timbuctoo, Lake Tchad, the Senegal, the Gambia, the Niger, and the Nile, of Darfur and the Soudan. It has acquired a footing on the Congo and the Zambesi; while Uganda, the most powerful of the negro States, has rejected Christianity, and seems likely to become Mohammedan.

In India Western civilisation, which is sapping Hinduism, only prepares the way for Islam. Wheeler, in his History of India, remarks that the people of India are drifting steadily towards Islam, and not towards Christianity. Of the 255 millions in India 50 millions are already Moslems, and of the whole population of Africa 60 millions or more than half.

Gibbon has acutely observed that it is not the first propagation of Islam that has to be explained—that can easily be accounted for--but it is the permanency with which it retains it hold upon its converts that rightly excites our wonder.

Christianity is less tenacious in its grasp. While in India and Africa it is receding before Islam, and in Jamaica the negroes, nominally Christian, are lapsing into Oboism, it may be affirmed that an African tribe, once converted to Islam, never reverts to paganism, and never embraces Christianity.

What is there in the doctrines of Islam which gives it this unique power of making converts and of retaining them? Why does it touch those whom Christianity fails to reach? Is it our fault or our misfortune? Can it or can it not be remedied? This is the practical question. Islam must in some way satisfy the religious needs and aspirations of the Indian and African races, or it could not thus succeed.

It must be acknowledged that, though quite unfitted for the higher races, it is eminently adapted to be a civilising and elevating religion for barbarous tribes. It is a step upward, but the step is not too high. Christianity is too spiritual, too lofty. Islam has done more for the civilisation of Central Africa than Christianity. With the disheartening accounts of missionaries as to the effects of their efforts, we may compare statements of English officials, or of lay travellers, such as Burton, Pope Hennessy, Galton, Palgrave, Thomson, or Reade, as to the practical results of Islam when embraced by a negro tribe. Paganism, devil worship, fetishism, cannibalism, human sacrifice, infanticide, witchcraft, at once disappear. The natives begin to dress, filth is replaced by cleanliness, and they acquire personal dignity and self-respect. Hospitality becomes a religious duty, drunkenness becomes rare, gambling is forbidden. Industry replaces idleness, licence gives place to law, order and sobriety prevail. Blood feuds, cruelty to animals and to slaves, are forbidden. A feeling of humanity, benevolence, and brotherhood is inculcated. Immodest dances and the promiscuous intercourse of the sexes cease; female chastity is regarded as a virtue, polygamy and slavery are regulated, and their evils are restrained. Islam, above all, is the most powerful total abstinence association in the world, whereas the extension of European trade means the extension of drunkenness and vice, and the degradation of the people; while Islam introduces a civilisation of no low order, including a knowledge of reading and writing, decent clothing, personal cleanliness, veracity, and self-respect. Its restraining and civilising effects are marvellous. All the more civilised tribes of negroes, the Mandingoes, Foulahs, Jolofs and Houssahs are Moslems, while in Lagos the hold of Christianity is feeble, and in Sierra Leone Christianity is actually receding before Islam. How little have we to show for the vast sums of money and all the precious lives lavished upon Africa! Christian converts are reckoned by thousands, Moslem converts by millions. These are the stern facts we have to face. They are extremely unpleasant facts. It is folly to ignore them. Is it possible to remedy them?

It is not, I think, a mere question of latitude or longitude, of climate or ethnology, as some would tell us. St. Augustine has well said that there is no widespread error that is not based on some fundamental truth. Is there any fundamental truth in Islam? The Moslem might plead for Islam, as Gamaliel pleaded for Christianity: "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

I think we ought to begin by recognising the fact that Islam is not an anti-Christian faith, but a half-Christian faith, an imperfect Christianity. Islam was a republication of the faith of Abraham and Moses, with Christian elements. Judaism was exclusive. Islam is cosmopolitan, not, like Judaism, confined to one nation, but extended to the whole world. If the imperfect laws of Moses were divinely sanctioned because of the hardness of men's hearts, may there not also be a divinely appointed work for the imperfect law of Islam? Islam, I say, must be regarded as an imperfect Christianity. Mahomet declared, "The God of the Christians is my God." Moslems acknowledge four great teachers—Abraham, the friend of God; Moses, the prophet of God; the Lord Jesus, the Word of God; and Mahomet, the Apostle of God. In the creed of Islam the Lord Jesus stands the highest of the four.

Though the teaching of Mahomet falls grievously short of the teaching of St. Paul, there is nothing in it antagonistic to Christianity. It is better than Judaism, inasmuch as it recognises the miracles, the teaching, and the Messiahship of Jesus Christ.

It is easy to understand why this reformed Judaism swept so swiftly over Africa and Asia. The African and Syrian doctors had substituted abstruse metaphysical dogmas for the religion of Christ: they tried to combat the licentiousness of the age by setting forth the celestial merit of celibacy and the angelic excellence of virginity—seclusion from the world was the road to holiness, dirt was the characteristic of monkish sanctity—the people were practically polytheists, worshipping a crowd of martyrs, saints, and angels; the upper classes were effeminate and corrupt, the middle classes oppressed by taxation, the slaves without hope for the present or the future.

As with the besom of God, Islam swept away this mass of corruption and superstition. It was a revolt against empty theological polemics; it was a masculine protest against the exaltation of celibacy as a crown of piety. It brought out the fundamental dogma of religion—the unity and greatness of God, that He is merciful and righteous, that He claims obedience to His will, resignation and faith. It proclaimed the responsibility of man, a future life, a day of judgment, and stern retribution to fall upon the wicked; and enforced the duties of prayer, alms-giving, fasting, and benevolence. It thrust aside the artificial virtues, the religious frauds and follies, the perverted moral sentiments, and the verbal subtleties of theological disputants. It replaced monkishness by manliness. It gave hope to the slave, brotherhood to mankind, and recognition to the fundamental facts of human nature.

To me it seems to be rank atheism not to recognise everywhere in history the finger of God, and unless we see in the marvellous spread of Islam, His purifying fire, cleansing the world from base superstitions in preparation for a higher faith, we must confess that the sceptre has fallen from the impotent hand of the King of all the nations.

The teaching of Islam is imperfect, it comes immeasurably short of the Gospel of Christ, which is so lofty that only the higher races of mankind have as yet been able to receive it and retain it. The higher Christian virtues—humility, purity of heart, forgiveness of injuries, sacrifice of self—these are not the virtues of Islam, which has no perfect pattern of humanity, and no aspiration after the Divine likeness. The Christian ideal is unintelligible to savages, but the lower virtues which Islam inculcates are what the lower races can be brought to understand: temperance, cleanliness, chastity, justice, fortitude, courage, benevolence, hospitality, veracity, and resignation. They *can* be taught to cultivate the four cardinal virtues, and to abjure the seven deadly sins.

The Christian ideal of the brotherhood of man is the highest; but Islam preaches a practical brotherhood—the social equality of all Moslems. This is the great bribe which Islam offers. The convert is admitted at once to an exclusive social caste. He becomes a member of a vast confraternity of 150 millions. A Christian convert is not regarded as a social equal; but the Moslem brotherhood is a reality. We have over-much "Dearly beloved brethren" in the reading-desk, but over-little in daily life. I do not underrate the attractions of the material paradise which the Koran offers, for it is this paradise which has abolished human sacrifice. The vast crowds of women and slaves slaughtered at the funeral of a negro chief to be his servants and companions in the future life are replaced by the seventy-two Houris of the Moslem paradise, created for the service of each believer; but I think the social privileges attained in this world are a more potent motive.

The Jews, of all races the most susceptible to lofty religious ideas, needed, nevertheless, a training of 2,000 years before they were fitted for the higher teaching of Christ. Can we expect the negro, with a low moral and cerebral development, with centuries of fetishism and savagery behind him, to receive at once that lofty Christian morality for which even the prophets and heroes of Hebrew history were not prepared? The teaching of Islam is not too spiritual or too exalted—but it is the school which may educate the African into fitness for a higher faith.

The Church of England, which I hold to be the noblest and purest form of Christianity, suited to the highest Aryan civilisation, has not been able to make any permanent impression on the African. It is too good for him. Islam, with its material paradise, or the Salvation Army with its kettledrums, or the Church of Rome with its black Madonnas, may be able to descend to the level of the negro; but the Church of England, with its Thirty-nine Articles, will not be the Church of Equatorial Africa for many generations.

The two great practical difficulties in the way of the conversion of Africa are polygamy and domestic slavery. Mahomet, like Moses, did not prohibit them, that would have been impossible, but he endeavoured to mitigate their evils. Slavery is no part of the creed of Islam. It was tolerated as a necessary evil by Mahomet, as it was by Moses and St. Paul. In the hands of Moslems it is a very mild institution, far milder than negro slavery in the United States. Mahomet enjoins the humane treatment of slaves; he encouraged emancipation as a religious duty. The Koran says:—"Though a man is your slave, yet he is your brother; he is to have the same food and the same clothes as his master. He who ill-treats his slave will not enter paradise." Slavery is an evil that will be destroyed by economical causes when it becomes an anachronism. Moreover, in the East, domestic service for women is impossible, save under the protection of polygamous marriage or servile concubinage. A woman who has borne a child to her master can never be sold or separated from her child.

Polygamy is a more difficult question. Missionaries —Mr. Johnson, of Zululand, for instance — tell us that it is the great thorn in the side of Mission work. Moses did not prohibit it, it was practised by David, the man after God's own heart, and it is not directly forbidden in the New Testament, though contrary to its spirit. Mahomet limited the unbounded license of polygamy. Monogamy is the rule, rather than the exception, in the most civilised Moslem lands—European Turkey, Algiers, and Egypt. Many intelligent Moslems are of opinion that the time is coming for its restraint or abolition, as unsuited to the times.

The Bishop of Lahore, among others, has made a courageous protest for the admission of polygamist converts to baptism, though not to holy orders, pleading the authority of St. Augustine and St. Ambrose, to which may be added that of Luther, Milton, and Whateley. It is unreasonable and cruel to expect a convert to put away a wife to whom he has been lawfully married by the law of Islam. Are these women, the mothers of a man's children, to be turned adrift to a life of ignominy? No man fit to become a Christian would be capable of such an unnatural and cruel act.

We must remember that polygamy with all its evils has its counterbalancing advantages. It has abolished female infanticide, and gives every woman a legal protector. Owing to polygamy, Mohammedan countries are free from professional outcasts, a greater reproach to Christendom than polygamy is to Islam. The strictly regulated polygamy of Moslem lands is infinitely less degrading to women, and less injurious to men, than the promiscuous polyandry which is the curse of Christian cities, and which is absolutely unknown in Islam.

Let us beware, lest in attempting prematurely to overthrow one evil we substitute a far greater evil. Polyandrous Englishmen are not entitled to cast stones at polygamous Moslems. Let us first pluck out the beam from our own eye before we meddle with the mote in our brother's eye. Nor should we forget that the four chief evils of Mohammedan lands, polygamy, slavery, servile concubinage, and license of divorce, are no exclusive reproach to Islam. Within our own memory, if not now, they have all prevailed in aggravated forms in the United States, a land nominally Christian, and peopled by a race of English blood.

In conclusion, I would venture to suggest that, if Christian Missions are to make any way in Africa, we must change our tactics. European teachers will never Christianise Africa—the experiment has been tried, and has failed. The climate alone is a fatal obstacle, and the social gulf is too wide. The heathen tribes, as Dr. Blyden has shown, can only be converted by bringing over from the United States civilised Christian negroes in large numbers.

With regard to Moslems, even this expedient offers small chances of success. Is it not worth while to try another method? Can we not attack the fortress of Islam from within rather than from without? Instead of raising antagonism by denouncing Mahomet as a false prophet and Moslems as infidels, let us begin by showing, not how much Christianity differs from Islam, but how much it resembles it. Islam recognises and embraces the teaching of Christ. Mahomet acknowledged His divine mission. Let us therefore say to the Moslems, "Your Koran, which you believe to be inspired, tells you that our God is your God. It tells you that Christ was the promised Messiah, the word of God. Listen, then, to the words which He spake, follow the pattern of His most holy life." Moslems gladly receive Arabic translations of the four Gospels. Let them read how Christ taught a more perfect morality, and set a more perfect pattern than Mahomet. Let the Gospels prepare the way before we perplex them with the strong meat of the Epistles of St. Paul, which, according to St. Peter, contain many things hard to be understood. And let us also for a time keep the Thirty-nine Articles and the Athanasian Creed out of sight. They are not suitable nutriment for negro races just emerging from barbarism.

Let us remember that in some respects Moslem morality is better than our own. In resignation to God's will, in temperance, charity, veracity, and to the brotherhood of believers, they set us a pattern we should do well to follow. Islam has abolished drunkenness, gambling, and prostitution, the three curses of Christian lands. Islam is the closest approach to Christianity which has been able to take hold of Eastern or Southern nations. It is, I venture to think, superior to the grovelling superstition of the Coptic and Abyssinian Churches. Moslems are already imperfect Christians: let us try to perfect their religion, rather than vainly endeavour to destroy it. We shall never convert the Moslems, but we may possibly transform Islam into Christianity. Thus we may find that in God's scheme Mahomet has been preparing the way for Christ.

If we thus regard the faith of Islam as an imperfect form of Christianity, plainly it requires to be reformed rather than subverted. All other methods having conspicuously failed, this at least might be tried. In its favour we may plead the example of St. Paul, who respects, instead of scorning, the religion of the Athenians, who quotes their own poets, and declares unto them the unknown God whom they had ignorantly been worshipping. We may plead also the higher example of Christ Himself, Who tells us that He came not to destroy the law of Moses, but to fulfil it. So let us also show the Moslems that the Gospel of Christ is able to fulfil what is lacking in the Koran of Mahomet.

[A twelve months' residence in Asia Minor enables us to fully endorse many of the statements of this excellent paper.—Ed.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

SIR,—Your correspondent, who signs himself "Edmund Lawrence," professes himself to be puzzled by the expression, "getting rid of priest and bread," which occurs in the letter of "Even-handed Justice." From the *Church Times* of November 4th I copy the following, which is an extract from an "Appeal to Wavering Nonconformists," by the Rev. F. Horton, who is, I believe, a Congregationalist minister in Hampstead, who took high honours at Oxford, and obtained a fellowship at New College:—

"Is it true that Christianity means an approach to God by the medium, and only by the medium, of an organised Church, with priests appointed by a mechanical Apostolic succession, in sacraments which are powers from God, acting through, and only through, the outward forms? Or is it true that a present living Christ, reached *immediately* by every earnest soul, received *directly* by every believing soul, dwelling *continuously* in every earnest, believing, and loving soul—is it true that that and that alone is Christianity, so that Church and priest and sacrament hardly come into the same place of vision? Our Puritan forefathers answered this last question with an emphatic Yes, and were ready to die for the truth of it. The Church of England as a whole, and to-day more rigorously than any time within the last two centuries, is answering it with an emphatic No!"

Here we see plainly what is meant by "getting rid of bread and priest." The latter the *Church Times* describes as the "consecrated mouth-piece" of the people. The editor then goes on to discuss Mr. Horton's opinions, but there is one point in this *Church Times* leader which cannot be passed over. "The penitent is not obliged to tell the priest anything unless he likes. He simply joins in saying, 'We have sinned by thought, word, and deed.' And the priest pronounces God's pardon upon him, conditioned only by his sincerity." How Jesuitical! Yes, true; the penitent *need* not tell all, but he is plainly taught in Ritualistic and Popish manuals that if he keeps anything back the absolution is null and void! Also what authority, will the *Church Times* editor tell us, have the priests of St. Alban's, Holborn, for teaching their so-called "penitents" to confess not only to God, but to "Blessed Mary and all saints," etc.? I know that they do so for a positive fact. Sir, it is the teaching of the *Church Times* and these Ritualistic father confessors that is ruining the Church of England, and filling the Dissenting chapels with those who would otherwise be faithful members of our Church.

OXONIENSIS.

November 5th, 1887.

CHURCH PRINCIPLES *VERSUS* THE LOW AND BROAD CHURCH PARTIES.

SIR,—A long controversy has gone on in reference to a new question and answer, introduced here in Ireland, into the Church Catechism. Whether they are taken from Catechism or Article, or whether the source from which they were taken is honestly or dishonestly described, must be really, to your readers, a matter of little consequence—a matter little worthy of so much heat and vituperation. But,

2. The real matter is of a very different style of importance. The whole movement issuing in the question and answer, was the struggle to make Priest and elements unnecessary, as vehicle or mean. This *animus* is apparent to any one who read the debates in the Synod at the time, or who reads the Report of the Revision Committee now. The Report quotes Ritualistic books, to the effect that the grace called our Lord's Body is given with the bread by the priest. This the Report utterly denies. The priest gives only the bread. The grace comes from God in Heaven, without intervention of priest or bread. Of course it has no objection to bread, or to an administrator. What it does object to is the doctrine that the grace comes from God, on consecration, to the bread, and with the bread to the devout recipient. To prove the needlessness of bread and priest, it quotes a Rubric, which is powerless, because Rome uses the same.

3. How were priest and bread to be got rid of? By means of the words in the Article, "the mean is faith." Any one in his senses must know that this, in the Article, could not have intended to make bread not a mean or vehicle, because the Catechism says that it is "a mean, whereby we receive the grace." All it could intend is that true devotion is a mean, without which the elements, and even God's gift can profit us nothing. Devotion is the mean on our part. On God's, the mean is the bread, given to us by one authorised to consecrate and administer. But this would not satisfy our revisionists. Faith is not merely a mean. It is *the mean*, to the exclusion of priest and bread. This is so plain in every page of the Report, that I need not say another word.

4. This was to be done by a new question and answer. As they are meant to get rid of priest and bread, they come very near to heresy. But, taking them to mean what the revisionists did *not* mean, that true devotion is what is required in us, they would be harmless. We now come to their intro-introduction, first in Report, and second in Catechism, heralded in the Preface. If it were said, question and answer taken, as they really are, from Catechism and Article combined, or one from one and one from the other, no one would object on that account. But that would not serve. The Catechism must be ignored. The Article must be the sole source of the change. It has long been the practice of a party to make the Articles the final appeal, though Sir J. Napier said the contrary in his state paper, viz., that our services were a higher authority than the Articles. But, in order to exalt our Articles, it is said of the Catechism, that it is "less full." This is because the Catechism says nothing about faith as the mean, on the recipient's part. But, in other respects, the Catechism is "too full" for our revisionists. For it says that bread is a mean, and it also says, "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received." However, as it is "less full," it is to be resorted to, for the question, how are the Body, etc. "taken and received"? Why the question to be answered out of the Article, was not also asked in the words of the Article, is manifest. The question would then be, "After what manner are the Body, etc., given, taken, and eaten?" But this language was intolerable to our revisionists. "Given" implies the priest, and "eaten" implies the bread. Therefore the Article must not give the question, though it does supply the answer to a different question, which can ignore priest and bread, how "taken and received"? The little game is now manifest. Priest and bread were to be got rid of, and that by means of the Catechism, when it was pretended that it was done by means of the Article. I take leave of this part of my subject. It is mere hair-splitting to draw distinctions between the various Committees, three in number. They were virtually the same men. The statements as to whence the question and answer are taken, the statements in the Report, twice repeated, cannot be overthrown by the fact that when they are spoken of in the Preface, and introduced into the Catechism, a comma is moved, in order to make it appear that the source is different from what it was stated to be by the very same men, when they drew them up.

5. I come now to a statement of mine, which your correspondent calls "abominable, impudent, and detestable." I have become so accustomed to his piscatorial style, that I read this with a smile of patience. I will repeat what I said. The Low Church party wanted to get rid of regeneration from the service. They said it meant conversion. The Broad party knew it meant only adoption by the Holy Ghost, and the embrace of God's mercy. Still they joined the Low party in demanding an alternative service. So much for this alliance. As to our Lord's Incar-

nation in the Athanasian Creed, the Broad wanted to get rid of the belief as of obligation. The Low party did not agree with them, yet they joined them. Such alliances may be "abominable and detestable," but am I so, for stating facts which must be known to all members of the then Synod? I turn from this subject to another.

6. "A Member of the General Synod" has come forward to back me up in all that I have said. He can say "*paix fin*." I thank him from my heart. But where are all the other High Church members, who fought in the Synod the same battle that I am fighting now? Why do they stand aside to see me crushed? Because they have since gone on to adopt a local presence and adoration. This I protest against, and therefore they are dumb, whilst I am called liar and slanderer, impudent, and what not? Well, thank God I can defend myself, and if they slink back from upholding now what they upheld in the Synod, if they slink from speaking for God, because I have spoken for Him, I leave them to the judgment of their own consciences, and to the sentence of all good men.

7. All this should not be uninteresting to you in England. You have the same parties as we have. The objects are, and the measures will be, the same.

8. A new correspondent has now intervened. But he does not seem to have read the controversy. I remit him to it.

EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.

SIR,—For one so given to the use of strong language, Mr. Lawrence is a curiously loose writer. "Faith," writes Mr. Lawrence, "is the only mean whereby grace is received"! Has he forgotten his catechism—"an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof"?

H. R.

[This discussion must now cease.—ED.]

◆

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." November, 1887. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

PROF. CURTISS'S paper on "The History of Israel from the Stand-point of Modern Criticism," reads like notes taken in preparation for a larger and more elaborate article. We are far from meaning this as a sneer; on the contrary, a little solid work is very acceptable, without padding. Professor Curtiss's "notes" are directed against Wellhausen's absurd theories. In answer to the utterly superficial argument that it is "amazing"—perhaps it is to those who live in a study, and know no more about human nature than they do about the other side of the moon—"that a revelation like that given in our Pentateuch should have been so long neglected and seemingly forgotten"; he well replies: "What more was to be expected of Israel, which during the time of Moses gave such evidence of a tendency to apostatize than that after his death and that of Joshua, they should live as though there were no written Zorah, surrounded as they were by heathen neighbours, who were only partially conquered, with whom they had constantly to contend for the maintenance of their new seats, without national unity, and doubtless with a corrupt priesthood."

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge shows from the "Apologies" and the "Dialogue with Trypho," that Justin Martyr was familiar with both the substance and the teaching of the *Didache*. We think he does show it, but we have an opinion that there must have been a great number of *Didaches*, and that there must also have been a strong family likeness amongst them. Justin Martyr may have quoted from any one of them, or rather he may have known them so well that his quotations were unconscious.

Professor Davidson's article on the R. V. of the Book of Proverbs is one of those articles which we note for future use. Speaking of the thirtieth chapter, and noticing Geiger's discovery of King Atkimus in the 31st verse, he adds: "The work of amending the text of the Old Testament is a very perilous one; all those who engage in it sooner or later become bereft of their reason." That is a hard hit for some very near home.

The *Expositor* becomes more and more the magazine for students.

◆

THE Rev. A. G. Edwards, vicar of Carmarthen, writes to the *Times*:—"It is related that at a certain European Congress the island of Java was ceded to the Dutch because the English Plenipotentiary present, ashamed to display his ignorance of its whereabouts, sacrificed this valuable possession. We may now hope that the Welsh Church has been saved from a similar fate. The diffusion of accurate information is obviously so important that I ask you to publish these facts and statistics relating to the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, in all respects the most important Nonconformist body in Wales:—(1) Lord Selborne has already made known the views of the founders of Welsh Methodism with regard to the Church. This argument—which you justly describe as one of sentiment--I would ask leave to fortify by the following quotation from 'The Rules, etc., of the Welsh Methodists Read and Agreed Upon in their Quarterly Association' at Bala, June, 1801:—'We do not designedly dissent or look upon ourselves as dissenters from the Established Church. In doctrine we exactly agree with the Articles of the Church of England, and preach no other doctrines but what are contained and fully and clearly expressed in them. We highly approve of her excellent and most evangelical Liturgy. . . . Making a sect or forming a party is not the object we are aiming at. God forbid!' (2) The following statistics, taken from the official year-books of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist body, are very important. The total number of communicants admitted by the whole Welsh Methodist body in the year 1884 was 10,655; in 1885 it was 7,723; and in 1886 it was 6,401. The decrease here is large and steady. The total number of hearers (*i.e.*, all who attend the chapels) in 1887 is given as 275,406, and in 1886 as 277,147. This shows for the last ten years an increase of only 1,741. It is also noteworthy that the number of hearers for 1886 is less by 892 than the number returned for 1885. To pass from numbers to finance, I find from the same official authority that the total sum collected by the whole Welsh Methodist body in 1884 was £173,845; in 1885, £172,012; and in 1886, £167,794. Here again the decrease in receipts is regular and serious. The receipts for 1878 were actually larger than in 1886. But the most remarkable fact recorded in the official year-book is the rapid growth of the debt on the chapels. In the year 1878 the chapel debt was £246,926; in 1881, £311,294; and in 1886, £323,118. The sum of money devoted to paying off the chapel debt in 1878 was £43,508, and this sum has been steadily decreasing until, in 1886, only £31,440 was given to this purpose—that is to say, that while the chapel debt has been increasing rapidly the annual contributions towards its liquidation have decreased as rapidly."

A MEETING on behalf of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa was held in the Hall of University College, Oxford, on Monday last, at 8.30 p.m. In the absence of the Master of the college, Canon Ince was voted chairman, and opened the meeting with prayer. In his introductory speech he mentioned two grounds of perplexity and trouble. First, the danger of collision between German and English missionaries consequent upon the increased protectorate and influence of Germany on the east coast of Africa; and, secondly, Canon Isaac Taylor's paper at the Church Congress, which tended to underrate the value of Christianity as compared with that of Islamism. He also referred to the falling off in the subscriptions to the Mission. The Rev. P. L. Jones-Bateman, Principal of the Kingani Theological College and School, who took as his subject released slaves, said that 99 per cent. of the slave traffic still went on as before in the mainland of Africa, notwithstanding English efforts to suppress it. Passing on to his special work at Zanzibar, he mentioned its three centres and stations—(1) the church on the site of the old slave market; (2) the Christian village with its girls' school; (3) the Kingani school and college for boys taken from slave dhows. Out of such material many were only suited for industrial work, but a good proportion after a fixed time of trial took holy orders as native ministers After touching upon the remarkably small number of failures among these men, the speaker concluded with an earnest appeal for greater interest and more men to carry on the work. The Rev. H. L. Geldart, from Magila, explained that Islamism had such a hold on the people because it aimed so low, and was bound to spread because it made no demand for a lofty morality. By a vivid contrast between the state of Africa fifteen years ago and what it is now, Mr. Geldart pointed out the temporal signs of improvement among the people, and the evident marks of spiritual progress; especially laying stress on the hopeful work among the children, and concluding with a warm tribute to Archdeacon Farler. The Rev. W. H. Penney then announced news about the Bishop and other members of the Mission, and reported satisfactorily on the condition of the steamer. He also expressed the great need of more subscriptions and more men. Canon Paget proposed a vote of thanks to Canon Ince for presiding, and showing such interest in the work; and to the Master and Fellows of the college for the use of the hall. The mission steamer had been overhauled, and the speed had vastly increased; and he hoped in the same way there would be greater signs of life and energy in this cause. Canon Ince, in acknowledgment, said he was much indebted to others for assistance, and especially to the Rev. C. Myers.

A NEW altar is about to be presented to Lincoln Cathedral by the Bishop of Nottingham. Various necessaries are still required, a new set of altar linen being needed. The estimate for three frontals, red, white, and green (the violet is already provided), and super-frontal, and for the complete set of linen, is £300. The linen will cost about £20.

THE Rev. J. F. Kitto, after prolonged hesitation, has reintroduced evening communion at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, where it had for some years been unknown.

◆

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arnold, Rev. W., Chaplain of the Taunton and Somerset County Hospital.

Bazeley, Rev. Frank Ley, M.A., Vicar of North Molton-with-Twitchen; Rector of Holy Trinity, Exeter.

Briddon, Rev. W. H., Vicar of Rushton-Spencer, Macclesfield; Vicar of Hixon, near Stafford.

Buckle, Rev. George, Rector of Weston-super-Mare and Prebendary of Wells; Canon of Wells Cathedral.

Cosbey, Rev. J., Curate of Stanhope; Vicar of Ings, near Windermere, Kendal.

Cundey, Rev. J. W., M.A., Principal of the Church Institute, Bolton; Rector of Emmanuel Church, Bolton.

Dolphin, Rev. Thomas William, Vicar of Carleton-le-Moorland, Stapleford.

Fenwick, Rev. William Augustus, M.A., Vicar of St. German's; Vicar of Bodmin.

James, Rev. T. M. R., Rector of Luckington, Chippenham.

Jones, Rev. John David, Curate of Llansamlet; Rector of Merthyr, Carmarthenshire.

Jones, Rev. Pierce, Vicar of Dolwyddelen, Carnarvon; Rector of Trawsfynydd, Merioneth.

Jones, Rev. Spencer John, B.A.; Rector of Batsfords-with-Moreton-in-Marsh.

Morgan-Brown, Rev. Nigel Mackenzie, M.A., Assistant Curate, St. Matthew's, Leicester; Priest-Vicar of Exeter Cathedral.

Mount, Rev. F. J., Prebendary of Sutton and Vicar of Cuckfield; Archdeacon of Chichester.

Ottley, Rev. Henry Bickersteth, M.A., Vicar of Horsham, Sussex; Rector of West Hackney.

Pain, Rev. R. W., Curate-in-Charge of Titchfield; Vicar of Acton Turville, Wilts.

Palmes, Rev. Arthur Lindsay, M.A., Vicar of Bodmin; Vicar of St. German's.

Pattisson, Rev. Houston, Curate-in-Charge of Langtree, Devonshire.

Payne, Rev. Charles Lennard, Vicar of Herodsfoot, Cornwall.

Pitman, Rev. Allan A., M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Tunstall.

Powell, Rev. Arthur Wentworth, B.A., Vicar of Llanddewi-Ystradenny with Llanfihangel-Rhydithon, Radnorshire; Rector of Disserth, Radnorshire.

Sheriff, Rev. Thomas Holmes, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Birkenhead; Vicar of St. Paul's, Stalybridge.

Thatcher, Rev. E. G., Vicar of Tamworth.

Tilley, Rev. John, Vicar of St. Arvan's and Vicar of Penterry, Chepstow.

Ward, Rev. John Magregor, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.

Williams, Rev. John Hughes, Curate of Brecon; Vicar of Llanddewi-Ystradenny with Llanfihangel-Rhydithon, Radnorshire.

Williams, Rev. W., B.A., LL.B., Vicar of Carlton-in-Snaith; Rector of Allendale, Hexham.

◆

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cookesley, Rev. Henry Parker, at Thwaite Rectory, Suffolk, on the 28th ult., aged 80.

Donne, Rev. Nathaniel Kemp, M.A., at 37, Mallison Road, on the 5th inst., aged 56.

Fowler, Rev. Newell Vicary, M.A., late Fellow of Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge, for twenty-four years Vicar of the parish, suddenly, at Ulting Vicarage, on the 1st inst., aged 57.

Gifford, the Hon. and Rev. John, at Siddington Rectory, Cirencester, on the 2nd inst., aged 65.

Hutton, Rev. Robert Rosseter, at Barnet Rectory, on the 5th inst.

Raynbird, Rev. Robert, Rector of Wentworth, Ely, Cambs, of heart disease, on the 29th ult., aged 67.

Walker, Rev. John Russell, Archdeacon of Chichester, suddenly, at the Chantry, Chichester, on the 30th ult., aged 50.

The Church of England Pulpit.

MIRACLES.

By the Most Rev. the BISHOP of MEATH.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, October 23rd, 1887.

"Go and tell John the things that ye do hear and see."
—Matthew xi. 4.

THE Baptist had incurred the anger of a petty oriental despot, generally one of the most vicious and contemptible of God's creatures, by telling him the truth. Herod had seduced his brother Philip's wife, and had married her when she had been divorced in consequence. This, John had told him was wrong. "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife." This plain speaking on the part of a mere subject, prophet although that subject was, the Tetrarch could not brook: besides, it might endanger him if it were not punished: others might go beyond remonstrance, if remonstrance were not checked. Accordingly, John was cast into prison; where, however, he seems at first not to have been unkindly treated, for Herod often communed with him, and did many things at his suggestion, or was perplexed as to many things by his admonitions,* and John's disciples seem to have had free access to their master. But the spirit of the wild prophet of the desert pined in confinement. Accustomed to range the prairie beyond Jordan in illimitable freedom, he sickened and drooped within the walls of a fortress. He became thoroughly discouraged: so far discouraged as even to begin to entertain misgivings of the truth of his own mission. He had been sent to herald the Christ: to prepare His way before Him: he had declared to the excited, anxious throng that Jesus was the Christ: he had gladly accepted that Christ's waxing and his own waning consequence. "He must increase, I must decrease," he had said: but he could not reconcile subsequent facts with his expectations. He heard in the prison of the mighty works of the Deliverer; and it seems to have suddenly struck him as with a deadly chill that the Man who could work such wonders might, and if so, surely ought to use His power for the purpose of delivering him from wasting the precious moments in a prison. "Doth God demand day-labour, liberty denied?" he might well ask. And so he became suspicious. Could it be that after all there was some mistake? That jealousy was at the bottom of this strange, heartless neglect? If so, could this be indeed He that should come, whom all were looking for, and on whom he himself had set the seal of prophetic approbation? So he sent two of his disciples to ask the decisive question, "Art Thou, indeed, He that should come, or do we look for another?" Still, even in his agony of doubt, John acted forbearingly. He did not proclaim it to the multitudes who obeyed and followed him: he imparted it only to two, the smallest number capable of giving in law a valid testimony. They came, they asked the question, doubtless with oriental fidelity, in their master's very words, "Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" No immediate answer was vouchsafed: Jesus was too busy in His mission of love for words. "In that same hour," we are told by another Evangelist, "He did many miracles: He healed diseases, restored to sight, cast out demons." Pausing after a while, the Saviour then turned to the two disciples, who, we may imagine, had been astonished, yet half-impatient spectators of these works, "Go and tell John the things that ye do hear and see: the blind receive sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the poor have the good news proclaimed to them:" the good news of deliverance from worse than earthly poverty, from disease more malignant than bodily distempers or defects. "And blessed is he whosoever is not offended in me," who does not stumble at my leading. This was the answer, the only answer, vouchsafed to the querulous and doubting prophet. But when the messengers had gone to bear its mixture of comfort and rebuke to their master, the Saviour showed to the multitude by His magnificent eulogium on the greatest of the prophets, that His judgment of John's character was not shaken by his, doubtless temporary, vacillation. That judgment assures us that the prophet's heart was right with God, though his faith had almost failed. And whose faith does not, now and then, almost fail? The unnatural interpretations that have been put on this passage in the Baptist's history by way of saving his reputation, only show the want of spiritual insight in those who have devised them. Let nothing rob you, my brethren—and I say this especially to those of you who are my brethren in the sacred ministry, or who are intending to become such—let nothing rob you of the deep comfort to be derived from an example of what you all, if you have any faith to be tried, must surely have felt yourselves. Like a holy man who records his own experience in one of the most powerful of the Psalms, John's "steps had well nigh slipped;" but we feel instinctively that the Saviour's message caught him by the hand, and saved him from falling.

John's doubts were summoned into dangerous life by the course of Divine Providence, of which the career of our Lord formed part. He could not understand why he should be so hardly treated. Here was the Deliverer, whose advent he had heralded, Whose presence he had proclaimed, Whose character he had exalted: and this Deliverer vouchsafed neither word nor sign to him in his distress. Was this loyal, was it faithful to his alleged mission to absolutely neglect His forerunner, to suffer him to be mewed up in gaol, there to eat his heart out, instead of being employed on the work that God had given him to do? The nature of this temptation to unbelief is obvious; its tremendous strength can hardly be repeated in any modern instance. Still, we, all of us who have gone any distance in the path of life, must have felt something akin to it; those, of course, most, whose function comes nearest to that of John. We have felt then, that our powers are strangely wasted in the positions that we occupy; we could do great things if only we were placed in different circumstances. We are mewed up, "cribbed, cabined and confined," some of us ministers of Christ, in small, insignificant parishes, where there is, as we fancy, hardly anything for us to do. "Give me a standing point," said Archimedes, "and I will move the world." We have no such standing point, and we don't move the world. Or we are limited—much too limited —in point of income. Not to speak of positive pecuniary distress, though that is an experience we are now frequently obliged to be acquainted with, we have not the means for effecting the good we feel we might effect, and are of course, certain we should effect, had we those means. Others might waste them, if they had them, but not we. Or John's prison becomes in our case the sick-room. We pine under disease; perhaps chronic and slow-wasting; perhaps perpetually recurrent in small, mean, apparently trifling attacks; which, nevertheless, do very effectually serve to consume our energies, and make them unavailable for good. Hundreds are the ways in which the mysterious Providence of the hidden Godhead mocks our expectations, baffles our wishes, till hope, the spring of life is, almost gone.

---

* πολλά ἠπόρει.—Revisers' Text.

But besides the difficulties arising from the mysteries of Providence, our age offers a further and altogether different set of difficulties, difficulties arising from the mysteries of nature, difficulties theoretical rather than practical, and to which the answer given by our Lord to John is no reply; which, indeed arise from that very answer. Theoretic difficulties, indeed, regarding Christianity at large, are the very feature which differentiates our age from all before it, because they are supposed to be the necessary outcome of that science the immense development of which is the special feature of our age. Science, it is now continually asserted, or without distinct assertion it is assumed, science has destroyed the very fundamenal postulate of revealed religion; the notion that God if indeed there be a God apart from Nature, can intervene in His creation in such wise as to make His intervention evident. Miracles, in other words, cannot take place. They would subvert the unchangeable laws of nature: they must be impossible, because they would reduce order to anarchy. Indeed, it is a mean and unworthy conception of the Deity, we are now told, which represents Him as reduced to violating the laws He has Himself established in order to make His wishes known. He cannot work miracles, because by doing so He would be breaking His own laws; and as He cannot, without miracles, convey to us any revelation of Himself beyond what those laws disclose, we are reduced to deny the truth of any revelation beyond that made to the mind by the investigation of Nature. Natural religion is therefore the only religion possible; supernatural religion must be a delusion.

I do not think that I have understated the strength of the supposed scientific argument against revealed religion, and before examining it I wish you to perceive clearly that one of its parts is perfectly correct. God cannot, without miracle, convey to manhood any verified revelation of Himself beyond what the laws of Nature give to every reflective mind. This is absolutely correct; and it is, indeed, the very basis of our Lord's reply to John the Baptist. It was to His miracles He appealed as the vouchers of His Divine commission. "Go and tell John the things that ye do hear and see." "If I had not done among them the works that none other man did, they had not had sin," viz.: in rejecting me. "If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then is the Kingdom of God come nigh unto you." If, then, He in reality did no miracles, He had, on His own showing, no Divine commission. Scientific men, therefore, are perfectly right in asserting that Christianity, at least as Christ understood it, rests on miracle. If miracles never happened, Christianity, in any sense of the term which is not a mockery, has no validity. I dwell on this, because there is now an attempt making to get up a non-miraculous, invertebrate Christianity, which may escape the supposed ban of science. And I would warn you emphatically against this new contrivance, this Gospel which is not a Gospel. Christianity is essentially miraculous if its Founder is to be believed, and falls to the ground if miracles be impossible.

But, let us ask, Why should miracles be impossible? The reply to this is, as I before said, Because they are violations of the laws of nature, which laws must be inviolable.

Now this reply consists of two propositions which are quite independent of each other, and ought to be kept quite separate from each other. The one is, that miracles are violations of the laws of Nature. The other is, that the laws of Nature cannot be violated, even by the Deity Himself.

I will take these two propositions in their order.

"Miracles are violations of the laws of Nature." Are they? Are men of science entitled to say this with absolute certainty? I know that most persons would say it quite off-hand. But I am not dealing with the inaccuracies of common parlance. I am dealing with scientific, or would-be scientific, assertion. And I again ask, are scientific men entitled to say of any miracle recorded in the New Testament that it is a violation of the laws of Nature? May it not be the introduction of the Divine volition through some unknown law, the action of which modifies the results of the action of the laws we are acquainted with? There are numberless phenomena which when first observed must have appeared miraculous, because the causes which produced them were unknown. Magnetism, for instance: when the power of a magnet to make a piece of iron jump up from the ground and stick to it, in spite of the force of gravitation, when this power was first noticed, it must have seemed miraculous: and had only one magnet been ever found, I have no doubt that magnetism would have been pronounced a delusion, just as we know that the fall of meteorites from the sky was actually pronounced a delusion by great numbers of scientific men in France during the last century. In the case of magnetism, the force, or whatever we may choose to call it, which modifies the results of the action of the law of gravitation, not its action in itself, is producible by ourselves at will, and can be experimented on. But may there not be laws which cannot be brought into action by the human will, laws perfectly amenable, however, to the Divine will, and which may modify the results of the action of the laws which we are, or can be, acquainted with? We have a very significant hint of the possible existence of such to us unknown, and by us unmanageable, laws in the existence of a phenomenon, universally familiar, and yet equally incapable of explanation, and of creation: the strange power, or whatever we may denominate it, which we call *Life*. Life is a something the presence or absence of which all can discern, and which is yet, in itself, not merely invisible and undiscoverable, though it exercises the most astonishing influence, but also unproducible. We cannot call it into existence where it does not exist, though we can destroy it where it does. It is outside the sum and play of forces—the correlation and transformation of energy, though it grasps into it and makes use of it. When any living creature loses its life, dies, in a word, it begins at once to decompose. We all know what rotting means. Why, then, does a dead body rot, while a stone does not? Simply because, so long as it was alive, its life held together in chemical combination, certain elements which no other force than the force of life can cause to combine, or keep in combination, in precisely those proportions. Here, then, we are brought face to face with a power so peculiar and so prodigious, that it can do what no other power can do; and yet we can neither get at it nor produce it. Like the Spirit in the vision of Eliphaz the Temanite, it is there, but we cannot see it. Life eludes investigation. Nay, more, it is utterly unlike any other power or force in nature, for it perishes in the act of being investigated. I have heard of an anatomist, who used to tell his class that he had been for years dissecting, and yet had never found the soul, nor the seat of the soul; the inference intended being that there was no such thing as soul. Fool! he might have said exactly the same thing of life. No one has ever found it or its seat. Now, just as there is one set of chemical laws for inorganic matter, like rocks and stones, salts, alkalis, and acids, and as there is another set of chemical laws which are only true for organic matter, such as vegetables, animals, and so forth; why may there not be one set of laws for organic matter and the laws of life, such as we know them and another, higher set of laws for matter actuated not by life, such as we now know it, a thing in each case fugitive and evanescent, but by spirit; spirit which can impart not merely a fugitive gift, but a permanent property? Such an idea seems to be countenanced by the remarkable words in which our Saviour contrasts the fleeting possessions of this world, life included, with the things which he calls "our own" in the future state, because when once given they can never be withdrawn. The possible analogy from the known to the unknown, from animal life, as we now know it, with its wondrous powers and peculiar chemistry, to spiritual life as it surely exists in God, and must, therefore, exist in various degrees of development and efficiency in those who are God's, above all others in the Son of God; the possible analogy from the commonly observed powers of the one to the powers of the other, observed not commonly, but only in special instances, and on great occasions, even as that life in itself is as yet hid from observation, this quite possible analogy from the known to the unknown is, I think, perfectly conceivable, and certainly comes in aid of the denial which, in the name of scientific modesty, I must pronounce on the assumption that miracles are violations of the laws of nature. For whether the probable analogy I have sketched be actual or not, this much is absolutely certain, that, unless we are acquainted with all the laws of nature, we could not pronounce of any given miracle that it was a violation of those laws. Will men of science claim omniscience? Unless they do, they had better abandon their first position as against the miraculous.

But, even granting miracles, such as those on which Christianity ultimately rests, if its founder is to be trusted, even granting miracles to be violations of the laws of Nature, of which we never can be sure, can we conceive the second proposition in the *a priori* argument against them, which is, that God cannot be supposed first to establish laws, and then to break the laws He has established?

Now, in the first place, this proposition derives its chief force from the idea that any, however occasional, violation of the laws of Nature would reduce all Nature to anarchy, and bring chaos back again. But the least reflection will show that this is not the case. No one would feel any uncertainty about the regularity of Nature; no scientist would entertain the slightest doubt of the truth or universality of any scientific result, merely because he perceived that a Person who claimed a direct Divine Commission, substantiated such claim by doing an act, or a series of acts, which proved that he had the same kind of power as the Creative Deity must be possessed of. Nay, the very claim made by such a Person itself rests on the validity and uniformity of the laws of Nature, and would lose all force if there were any uncertainty in their general action. But for the regularity of Nature, miracles would have no evidential value.

Secondly, this proposition is founded on a reasoning concerning the character of God, which a little reflection will show to be highly presumptuous. Exclusive of immorality, of doing what is opposed to the moral law, how can we argue as to what the Deity may or may not do? Is this world constituted exactly as we might have expected it to be? That there is but one God is the dictate of Reason as well as of Revelation: even those who supposed that there were two opposing principles active in the work of Creation, were yet forced to conceive them both as issuing from one Final Cause: this one God, the Final Cause of all things, must be supposed omnipotent, and as being the foundation of all morality, must be supposed good: for if not, the monstrous principle would be introduced that the stream can run higher than its source; that the creature can be better than the Creator. Yet how is the prevalence of sin, of sorrow, of suffering, in the creation of omnipotent Goodness, explicable by our finite intellect? Again, the whole law of growth, of slow evolution, and gradual progress from the more to the less imperfect, (for the perfect we never see at all,) is it what we should have devised if we had been consulted? What must we think of an argument which really rests on the fond supposition that God's thoughts must be exactly the same as our thoughts, and His ways as our ways?

But, further, science itself proclaims unmistakeably some interventions of Divine power, which certainly do each amount to what is virtually the introduction of new laws, apparently suspending or violating former laws, at any rate modifying very materially their action. To the creation of matter itself I shall not go back; the solitary eternity of God before Creation in time began, is an abyss into which our vision cannot penetrate; the mind turns giddy as it gazes down into it. But the fact that Creation itself has stages, that it proceeds by interrupted steps, not by continuous slope, is now becoming more and more generally acknowledged. And it is extremely puzzling. Science would fain deny it if it could. Thus this earth, we are now well aware, was at one time void of life. How then did life, with its peculiar chemistry, come into it? With the first all but invisible morsel of protoplasm, or living substance, was introduced a whole new range of laws, contradictory to, at least modificatory of, the laws of chemical action as previously existing. What was this but a miracle on an enormous scale, miracle in everything except the presence of spectators? And yet spectators are not really wanting to it, for science now forces us to behold it with the eye of reason. And if the introduction of life, animal and vegetable, was the introduction of a new set of laws, suspending or modifying the action of the laws of chemical affinity as previously existing, why may not the introduction of spiritual life be likewise accompanied with the suspension or modification of the action of the laws of animal life, as previously existing? This, though it has hitherto been little noticed, is really the *rationale* of the greatest of all miracles, the Resurrection of our Lord: a miracle like that of the introduction of life into our planet in this respect also, that of its actual transaction there were no spectators. That great act, that fact is regarded by St. Paul as the introduction into man's nature of a new law of life, the law of a spiritual life, to be manifested in ourselves hereafter in a spiritual body, incapable of dying, because animated by spirit, which is a deathless principle. What marvel if the first introduction of this into our nature in the case of Christ should be accompanied as by natural necessity, with signs and wonders not accidental nor anarchic, but connected with it in power and method and meaning, and only so far, therefore, exhibited as this connection made it necessary? Is there not a dim foreboding of this truth in the saying of the startled and frightened tyrant when he had beheaded John, and heard the mighty deeds of Christ. "It is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead, and *therefore* mighty works do show forth themselves in him."

My brethren, the whole outcome of the reflections through which I have been taking you, is, that Christianity is an *historical* religion, and must be judged of on historic grounds, and not by prejudices or systems, whether scientific or metaphysical. It is an historical religion, resting ultimately on the actual reality of certain facts in the history of the world. "Go and tell John the things that ye do hear and see," said our Saviour to the messengers of the doubting prophet. It is on the things which the disciples saw, and have reported to the world, that the claims of our religion ultimately rest. That religion might have been true as to its facts, if no one had seen these things: the facts might have taken place, if they had never been reported to us. But in that case we could not have known it as a religion. Christ might have died for men in solitude. He might have risen from the dead and no eye beheld Him. But in that case we should not have known that He had indeed died for our sins, and risen for our justification; and the whole stupendous efficacy of the knowledge of these great facts in all duly receptive minds would have been wanting. Whether without such effect, by some physical, exclusive of mental, means, that great Death and Resurrection would have been made available to us, we cannot pronounce with certainty, though it seems highly probable. But the moral and spiritual influence of these facts on the heart and mind would have been absent; and a far lower grade of operation would have been the result, a grade measurable in some degree by the difference between the heathen and the Christian world. It is not for nothing that Christ is preached, it is not for nothing how He is preached, and on what grounds He is believed. We base our faith not on *à priori* reasonings, not on metaphysical theories, not even on the intrinsic fittingness of the Christian Revelation, though this last is doubtless a strong corroboration; we ground it on ample historic testimony, on the things heard and seen by thousands of witnesses, reported by them to thousands and tens of thousands more, who could not in the nature of things be so highly favoured, but who, like those from whom they heard the inspiring tale, were nerved to do and to dare in the cause of God and goodness; to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts in the very acme of their development, and to conquer all the power of sensuality, all the rebellion of the intellect, nay, the very structure of society itself, armed as it was with every resource of unbridled despotism. "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean!" the dying apostate-emperor is said to have exclaimed: and the exclamation, whether really uttered or not, expressed the truth. Without the least assistance from the mechanism of policy or force, Jesus of Nazareth had conquered: and we are now asked, forsooth, to believe that he conquered without any real Divine commission, without any real right, on false pretences, and by mere deception! It is a slander on humanity; it is a libel on common sense. No! brethren; the works He did, and enabled His first followers to do—His resurrection, above all—declared and defined Him to be what He claimed to be, the Son of God with power; and though we no longer see miracles performed before our eyes, because they are no longer wanted to accredit a message once for all accepted on their score, we feel that nothing but such mighty works could have started and launched Christianity on its career of conquest, could have justified its immense assertions. If they could have been denied at the time they were performed, they would have been denied; for there was plenty of materialistic scepticism then, and the majority of those who saw them were bitterly hostile to those that wrought them. But they were perpetually appealed to, and were never denied. And if we find greater difficulty in accepting them than those who saw them, it must be remembered, on the other hand, that we see what they could not see, their enormous and lasting results. We see a Divine polity, a city of God, as St. Augustine called it, which, unlike all other religions, knows no difference of race or place; which is equally suitable to all and equally raises all; which is rapidly overspreading the world in spite of their foibles, the sins, the treacheries of many of its subjects and administrators; which has seen empires come and go, and society altogether change, itself adapting itself to every form of human association, assimilating and using every new truth discovered by the intellect of man. In this case, at any rate, "Might makes right." The religion must be true which has thus conquered and transformed.

Let me, in conclusion, add a word especially intended for my younger hearers, whose more plastic minds are in process of formation by the studies of this place, or by independent studies of their own. And I venture to think that they are more especially in need of the caution I am going to give, because the young are particularly susceptible of generous admiration, and generous admiration is often abused for the purpose of gaining undue influence.

It is often supposed that scientific men may be trusted beyond other men, as being solely animated by pure love of truth. Pure love of truth! where, alas! shall we find it? Perhaps in the investigations of mathematics, or of those sciences which entirely or chiefly depend on mathematics, such as astronomy and mechanics. But when science touches on moral or religious questions, and more especially, when, in doing so, science deals not with laws but with hypotheses, then science, if indeed, it deserves the name, is not to be implicitly trusted. "Dear children, keep yourselves from idols!" In no department of life and thought is the farewell warning of the beloved Apostle more required than in the domain where natural, and mental, and moral science touch; where physics, philosophy, and religion, are conterminous. "Keep yourselves from idols!" Put not implicit faith in any teacher, however great; in any supposed discoverer further than as a recorder of facts alone! So soon as he begins to theorise, to frame hypotheses, however plausible, distrust him. Put not implicit faith, either, in the spirit of the age: the *Zeitgeist*, as some modern writers, unnecessarily borrowing a German phrase, denominate it. The spirit of the age, two hundred years ago, led people to believe in witchcraft and to burn witches. The spirit of the age now impels people to revive witchcraft under another name, whilst ridiculing their ancestors for believing it. Is it more to be trusted in the one case than in the other? The Romish Church recommends to implicit belief every trumpery miracle wrought by the bones of apocryphal saints; the Infidel Church, an equally real and almost as well organised a society, tells you to believe no miracles at all, quite regardless of moral connection and of historical result. Reject both these dictates; distrust equally the too little and the too much; recall the deep saying of the Greek sage, *μηδὲν ἄγαν*—"Nothing in excess." Credulity and incredulity are really the same mental imperfection exercised in different directions. Examine things for yourselves; be not subject to dictation—the dictation of any set or clique. Do not allow yourselves to be terrorised into mental imbecility by great names and blustering assertion. There may be a Cæsarism, even in science; perhaps put into commission, when the ruling Cæsar dies. It is well, therefore, to recollect that critics, even the most subtle and contemptuous, have, on occasions, been egregiously mistaken; that scientific theories, though trumpeted to the world with the whole authority of contemporaneous science, have been proved to be false. Be not, therefore, bullied out of your religion by assertions, however positive: by assumptions and airs of superiority, however imposing. In this world there are, as the Apostle says, and always have been, "Gods many and lords many." There are plenty of infallible guides who will lead you, if you will but follow them, into the ditch; into conclusions which, after a few years, will have to be surrendered to others, perhaps equally well founded. But there is, after all, only one God and Father of us all, and one Master, Jesus Christ, Whom all may be well content to follow—a Master Who kept within the bounds of His commission, and Whose authority was not self-assumed, self-imposed, but rested on the evident voucher of deeds which no spectator of them ever questioned, of words which after two thousand years are as fresh, and true, and living as they were when first uttered in Jerusalem, the university of prejudice, or on the shores of Lake Tiberias, the home of simple common sense.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

By the Rev. CHARLES RICHARD PANTER, M.A., LL.D.

Sermon Preached in Swift's Alley Church, Archdiocese of Dublin.

> "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them."—Rev. xiv. 13.

THIS quotation has often been selected as the nucleus around which to weave the mournful web of a funeral oration. But I could never comprehend why it should be reserved exclusively either as the text for a passing consolation offered to mourners over the coffin of their dead, in a mortuary chapel, or, as a stereotyped motto devised to the dead in mortmain, and cyphered upon the sepulchral slab, until, from very repetition, this text has become the platitude of the tombstone. The words, to my mind, have more of the warmth of present comfort for the living, seated in their ordinary church pews, than they can possibly yield of the cold chill of consolation to mourners grieving in the gloom of the cemetery chapel. They declare distinctly a condition of the soul from the moment of the body's demise to the moment when the last trump shall sound, summoning all souls to appear before God to receive the verdict of eternity.

There are three assertions made in the text with respect to the dead which die in the Lord. They are pronounced blessed from henceforth, that is, from the instant of their departure: their blessed state is ordained to be one of rest from their labours; and it is declared that their works do follow them, do not precede nor do they accompany them, but do follow them. These three circumstances of the being of the Lord's departed, I shall essay to set forth under the warranty of Holy Scripture.

(*a*) How the dead dying in the Lord are blessed.

(*b*) The place and nature of their rest.

(*c*) Why, when, and whitherward their works do follow them.

These circumstances combined determine that there is an intermediate state, a spiritual time-period for the soul after it quits its earth-life, and before it enters upon the unsetting day of untold duration. It is evident, if the soul were judged at death for the deeds done in the body, there would be no necessity for a judgment-tide at the end of the world's history. We know that the bodies of the dead rest in their graves until the great general resurrection, and we are also aware that this resurrection does not take place until the end of the world. Therefore there must be an intercurrent period for the soul between the day of death and the day of Judgment; and the soul will not be judged for the deeds done in the mortal body, until the risen body itself shall appear.

The existence of the soul, I take then, to be divided into three self-evident periods These are, its earthly time-period, or life of probation in the body; its spiritual time-period, or life of rest, dating from its migration from the body corruptible to its union with the body incorruptible at the great general resurrection; and its existence after judgment-tide in the New Heaven of glory during the timeless period of eternity. There is, however, another and earlier resurrection alluded to in the Bible, called the *first* resurrection, betokening the arising of the soul to an intermediate state of bliss. The words denoting this resurrection are:—"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years." (That is, reign with Christ for a definite period—for the spiritual time-period.) Now the blessing pronounced on those having part in this first resurrection, reduplicates the blessing of our text on the dead which die in the Lord, either benediction confirming the other in the assertion of immediateness of bliss. Blessed *are* the dead, not blessed *may* the dead be which die in the Lord—no doubtful speaking as of a dubious state of bliss; no, but a decided declaration that the dead which die in the Lord are blessed "from henceforth." "From henceforth" excludes the notion of one moment's sting of pain or penalty, between death and bliss, for the Lord's beatified. Read and render as we may the Canon of God's truth, from cover to cover, neither our reading nor our rendering will shadow on the mind the faintest idea of the soul having to undergo any sin-purifying process, by fire or other element, to qualify it for residence in any one of the Father's many mansions. From every point of view, the meaning of the text is levelled against that phantom-doctrine of error which supposes the existence of a sphere of posthumous soul-purification. If such a sphere of punitive probation existed after death as a kind of noviciate for the brotherhood of heaven, no Voice from heaven would call, saying—Blessed and resting from their labours *are* the dead which die in the Lord.

(*a*) How, then, are those souls blessed which at the body's dissolution pass into the spiritual time-period of rest, preceding the epoch of the great general resurrection? They are blessed with immediate participation in the joy of the holy departed out of all past time; and, from their kin-likeness to angelic nature, this joy must be of an accumulative character, because the advent of other holy souls is ever multiplying the community of just men made perfect. So that, intensifying, pauseless joy is theirs. In this happy condition, the former wretchedness of being encompassed by the wretchedness of the wicked hath neither title nor tittle of tenure. Here, the will-propension is to holiness; God's will is saint's will: by sanction, sin is cast into outlawry; suffering, here, is published null and void, and punishment decreed invalid. They are blessed, because beyond the frontier of the earthly time-period, the sway of the prince of this world ceases; his malign influence cannot penetrate into the spiritual time-period of the Lord's beatified, insinuating temptation, producing a swarm of evil thoughts and wishes, doubts and dreads, such as aforetime plagued like parasites the flesh-hampered soul. They are blessed, because here cannot lurk the felon cares and sorrows besetting the highways and byways of earthly existence, for they have al been arrested and condemned to transportation for eternity to the captive shores of death and woe. Chiefly they are blessed in this saint-land of innocence renewed, because conscious of the personal presence of that Holy One—the Saint Who never sinned—Who died accursed that they might live to die, and die to live, blessed in Him;—die to live in His actual company, and commune with Him more freely and much more delightfully, than the Three Apostles did upon the high Mount of Transfiguration, where they exclaimed, "Lord, it is good for us to be here." This higher intercourse with Christ results from beholding Him as He is in His spiritual glory—the fashion of His sorrow-stricken, human countenance changed—His attire paling the starry splendour of angelic robes, and His face shining as the sun in the Majesty of Divine love and satisfaction. For here He beholds His blessed ones joy-partners with Himself, and sees in them the reward and satisfaction of the travail of His soul. On Hermon's hallowed height He introduced earth to Paradise, and Paradise to earth; summoning two glorified souls, Moses and Elias, to appear in visible form, and bear witness to three men in the body, Peter, James and John, of the soul's animation when absent from the body. Here, without question, souls in the body and souls absent from the body, were equally present with the Lord. Moses and Elias' case was not, as it were, one of suspended spiritual animation, but it was a case of full, perfect soul-vitality, dating from the moment they were "accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead; neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection"—that is, the brethren of the Lord in Paradise

(*b*) The place and nature of the rest of those dying in the Lord.

Their place of rest lies within the precincts of one of God's many mansions, and its Lord called it Paradise. It is the appointed abode where blessed souls rest from their labours for the space spanning the spiritual time-period between death and the Great Judgment. Its space-distance from earth mortal mind cannot mete: its time-distance is brief at the longest, and at death is measured by the throb of an instant. Paradise is a Persian word, signifying the exquisite pleasure-grounds and gardens, rich and rare with flowers and fruits, surrounding the palace of a monarch. In the Septuagint the word Eden is rendered Paradise; and Paradise, spiritually viewed, is the Eden of the Second Adam, like as the New Jerusalem is the symbolic name of the Heaven of God. When upon the encrimsoned Tree of Calvary, the Lord of Paradise hung agonised, He told the thief who prayed to be remembered in the Kingdom of the Divine Sufferer (Who was suffering more agony for that thief than the criminal could possibly suffer for himself), He told him, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." His last act was to make a sinner a saint, and unlock for him the gates of Paradise. His last act was the pledge of what He does for all sinners who suffer with Him upon the cross of flesh-crucifixion, and who die in the benediction of His love.

Oh! ye blessed souls dying in the Lord, as rose to life your dear Lord's dead humanity in a garden on the slopes of Olivet, hard by Jerusalem, even so shall ye rise to the life immortal in a garden blooming on the hills of peace perpetual—the garden of the new and better Paradise that lieth hard by New Jerusalem, within eye-ken of the beauty and within ear-shot of the melody of the City of the Great King.

Where, then, lieth this Garden of God? Beyond the focus of the finest faculties of the embodied soul, when the light of spiritual vision is brightest, within a region natural eye hath never seen, lieth the Paradise of God, where the saints enjoy the delights inconceivable which God hath prepared for them that love Him. A human being, Paul by name, midway in his laborious ministry, by God-given invitation, once entered the resting-place of the blessed, and returned thence to his labours on earth. He returned, but not to describe its unutterable glories, and abundant revelations, nor to translate its unspeakable words. In that realm was spoken a language given him to understand only in the society of its inhabitants, but incapable of interpretation in the sin-sullied speech of mortals. This witness states that he was "caught up *to* the third heaven— "—"caught up *into* Paradise." Paradise, therefore, lies *within* the third heaven, and is the fixed abode of the sainthood of the Elect Order of Christ the King of Glory. For "the glory which Thou gavest me I have given them." . . . "That they may behold My glory which thou hast given Me." While in the society of that sainthood, he was conscious of his identity as Paul of Tarsus, although of his entity, whether he was in the body or out of it, God knew, but Paul could not tell. Paradise to Paul was no mere mirage of Heaven, but as literal a reality as Eden was to Adam.

What is the nature of the repose of Paradise? It may be defined as the absolute possession of the perfection of that peace which passeth all understanding, when the soul reclines in bliss on the bosom of unlimited love—the bosom of God. Thereon, the earth-overwrought soul restores and strengthens its spiritual tension, and augments delight with the increase of strength. Rest of the earth-overwrought soul in Paradise is not like bodily slumber, a mere strengthening trance for a renewed spell of toil; it is not the supine calm of dreamy silence, nor the opiate of suppressed, stifled feeling; it is not an involuntary, enforced peace, such as might be compared to that wherewith of old the Galilean Sea was quelled to quiet; but it is a peace, "the central feeling of all happiness," the perfect development of the living Christ-peace borne of the words, "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you,"—it is the love-born peace of soul, begotten of Almighty affection. We have, through the veil of the parable of Dives and Lazarus, a glimpse given us into the nature of the life lived in Paradise. This glimpse is granted with the object, we may infer, of satisfying a little our craving for knowledge concerning the things naturally unseen, but spiritually discernible. From the revelation contained in this parable, we learn, that the life is one of sweet comforting; that it is far removed from the habitation of the wicked, who cannot cross the impassable gulf entrenching Paradise, to assail the peace of the saints' rest; which likewise cannot be disturbed by consciousness of the torment of God-exiled souls. As these souls when in the body, would not have God for their Father, God will not have them when out of the body, for His sons. Their doleful state is epitomised in the words, as "As a certain fearful looking for of judgment to come."

(*c*) Why, when, and whitherward their works do follow them.

Wherefore, do the works of the dead which die in the Lord *not* accompany them? Why *must* they follow them? Their works cannot accompany them, because they are not completed at their death, and they cannot be completed until the world itself is dead. Although a man at death is done with works, his works are not done with him. They live on and work on: for deeds do live though dead their doers be. The effect of a man's deeds—the work of his works—is as long lived as the life-period of all mankind after him, because the effect of deeds gives new impulses. Impulse may breathe, act, and die, but the action it has evolved, becomes the parent of a prolific progeny of consequences, good or evil. God's grace presses with unseen touch the spring of the good man's impulse. Even here on earth, we, mere time-judges, can trace backwards the pedigree of many a noble result to the heaven-stirred impulse of a humble soul:—Grace Darling, the light-house keeper's daughter, by Heaven-struck impulse, becomes the mother of a guardian motherhood that rescues the imperilled children of the sea:—and John Pounds, the lowly cobbler, becomes the father of a fostering fatherhood that snatches from ruin the land-waifs of ignorance and destitution. Consequently, until Time is dead, the total of a man's works, with their achievements upon his own generation and all succeeding generations, cannot be struck, because it cannot be computed until shall be opened the Great Sealed Books of God. *Then* is the *when* that the works of the dead—the dead in the Lord or the dead out of the Lord—do follow them. For God's foreknowledge of all results does not interfere with His patient waiting for their actual development. This is the whole why and wherefore, why the works of the dead which die in the Lord must follow, and cannot precede nor accompany them, nay, not even into the Paradise of Rest. This argument disposes of the fond notion that works can save any man; and faith itself is but the work of that Grace which wills and works salvation. Yet good works, although they do not save a man, bear a faith-reward hereafter, which shall be awarded their doers at the Final Arbitration Day, when small and great stand before God, and the dead are judged out of the things which are written in the Books according to their works.

Whitherward do the works of the dead follow them? Either heavenward or hellward. Good works fly heavenward. Like the white doves presented in the earthly temple at Jerusalem, they are, by acceptance of the Great High Priest, received in God's Eternal Temple—Heaven. Then, let these fledglings of faith in flocks follow us Godwards to the Great White Throne, where the Saviour of His brethren shall welcome His Paradise-companions into the timeless period of blissful eternity, with "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." And evil works, too, have their due destination; for they sink hellward. Like an unclean brood that long for darkness, they seek and find their home-abode, whence the Accuser of his brethren, Satan, shall unloose them, and present them at the judgment-seat, as tokens of chattelship in his horrible own, upon whom the sentence shall go forth—"Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

Then, let us pray, that during the earthly time-period, God the Holy Ghost may be our Guide and Comforter:—that during the spiritual time-period, God the Son may be our King and Companion:—so that during the timeless period of a heaven-spent eternity, God the Father, together with the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Ever One God, may be our Almighty All and All.—Amen.

* * *

On Monday last the Hon. and Rev. F. R. Grey, rector of Morpeth, on attaining his jubilee as priest, was presented by his parishioners and friends with an illuminated address and a cheque for nearly £300. A gold bracelet was also presented to Lady Elizabeth Grey.

Speaking at Aldershot on Saturday, the 5th inst., the Chaplain-General (Dr. Edghill) said there were rumours of a great change before the Church of England. Many people regarded her as something to be kicked about by politicians; but she was an anvil that had worn out many hammers. If disestablishment should come, and men should, for the sake of power, steal the birthright and privileges God had given the land, the Church would not despair. The strength of the Church lay not in endowments nor in *prestige*, but in the truth on which she was based.

BRONCHITIS, ASTHMA,
COUGHS, COLDS,
CONSUMPTION,
and al Pulmonary Affections can be immediately relieved and rapidly
CURED
by simply using the
AMMONIAPHONE
FOR THE Voice, Throat, Chest, and Lungs.
21s. post free.
WILL LAST FOR YEARS.
Used and recommended by the Royal Family, and principal Physicians, Clergymen, Vocalists, and Public Speakers throughout the country. New illustrated Pamphlet with copies of Thousands of Testimonials may be had FREE OF CHARGE on application to Medical Battery Co. Ld.
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1887.

THE MENTAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN.

OUR happiness as well as health in mind, body and estate, hinge so much upon the relative interests, claims and capacities of men and women, that too much assiduity cannot be employed in endeavouring to form a correct opinion upon a question whose issues are so vital and far-reaching. The modern movement for promoting the higher education of women would have been impracticable but for the conviction that this enlarged culture was not only feasible but an obvious duty. The wretched education which was formerly thought good enough for young women — the scraps of history and mythology, of arithmetic and geography, of music, French, and deportment, long the staple curriculum at "finishing" schools for young ladies—could have been tolerated only by a generation which had accepted without question or examination the low estimate of female intellectual power prevailing in a former period. Hence such questions as those so ably handled by Mr. Romanes and Miss Edith Simcox, in papers recently published in the *Nineteenth Century*, are no mere academic discussions, but problems pregnant with conclusions of great practical importance.

Neither Miss Simcox nor Mr. Romanes are partizans of either side. The apparent partiality of one writer is rectified and counter-balanced by that of the other. Mr. Romanes sums up "with almost brutal frankness" the various intellectual deficiencies of women, real or supposed, but adds that "these elements of weakness are in chief part due to women as a class not having hitherto enjoyed the same educational advantages as men."

The opponents of the higher education of women are somewhat short-sighted, when they dwell with apparent satisfaction upon the superiority of men in depth of insight, comprehensiveness of view, originality, creative faculty, and judgment. Granted that in these respects women are, as a class, somewhat inferior to men, the legitimate deduction is not that feminine culture is useless or futile, but rather that it should be encouraged by every means in our power, in order that women may as soon as possible make up the arrears of mental cultivation consequent upon centuries of apathy and of neglect of their intellectual faculties. We are surprised that Mr. Romanes should attach so much importance to the fact of the female brain weighing on the average about five ounces (one-tenth of the whole) less than the male. We are not prepared to admit either of the premisses upon which an argument can be founded for regarding this deficiency as a conclusive sign of intellectual inferiority. These premisses are first, that the size of the brain is an adequate gauge of mental power; and, secondly, that the difference of size between the brains of men and women is greater than might be expected from the difference in the weight of their bodies. As regards the first point, cerebral physiology is still too little understood to enable us to say more than that, as a general rule, idiots have small brains and men of distinguished capacity large brains. When we eliminate the exceptions, either of excess or defect, it is by no means clear that the possession of a few ounces of brain-matter above the average is a fair index of intellectual pre-eminence. The remarkable conclusions of Professor Ferrier have established a surprising closeness of relation between the brain substance and the muscular system, while they have shed very little light upon the connection between cerebral matter and intellect. It is a very fair question for investigation, whether the smaller brain, like the smaller blood-corpuscles, of the woman is not in large part due to her comparative muscular inactivity.

As regards the second premiss, namely, whether the smaller brain of the woman is not simply part and parcel of her smaller body, we are by no means satisfied with Mr. Romanes' somewhat dogmatic statement, that the deficiency of five ounces is "proportionally a greater difference than that between the male and female organisms as a whole." It is a very open question whether the body weight of the average man does not exceed that of the average woman by fully one-tenth.

While we thus take exception to some of Mr. Romanes' arguments, we fully agree with him in his condemnation of the fatuous notion of some *doctrinaire* reformers that there is no such thing as sex in mind, and that, granted an identity in training and environment, men and women would be in all respects mentally alike. We propose to discuss this theory in a future article, and must now rest content with the statement that both biology and psychology emphatically condemn it.

The progress of female education during the brief period in which it has been intelligently and thoroughly cultivated is surely very striking. Women are everywhere justifying the hopes of their champions, and disappointing the gloomy prophecies of their opponents. Their University successes have exceeded the most sanguine anticipations, and such a brilliant achievement as that of Miss Ramsay at Cambridge this year is enough to cause grave questionings to believers in the natural and inherent intellectual inferiority of women.

If it be true, as many physiologists and writers on heredity assert, that men derive their brain power and intellectual characteristics for the most part from their mothers, it is a matter of the greatest national concern that the mothers of future citizens should have well-trained, vigorous and efficient intellects.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

MOHAMMEDANISM.

SIR,—I have read Canon Taylor's "excellent paper,' but cannot endorse your approval of it; not for the reasons advanced by several writers in the *Times* against it, but because I think it entirely mis-states the relations of Mohammedanism to Christianity.

Mohammedanism is not a step towards Christianity, but a positive contradiction to it in several most important points.

1. The Christian doctrine concerning our Saviour is, to all except those who call themselves "Unitarians," that Christ was God as well as man. This is the extreme of blasphemy to Mohammed and his followers, the worst term of abuse poured on any non-believers being the reproach that they were "Mushrics," *i.e.*, persons who mix the Godhead with the Manhood. This comes over and over again in the Koran.

2. The conception of heaven, or Paradise, exhibited and dwelt on in the Koran, is an entirely sensual one, in which sexual pleasure, with enormously increased or indeed unlimited powers for it, is the chief part. This is entirely contradictory to the doctrine of Christ, who says that in heaven "they neither marry nor are given in marriage"; and to the declaration of St. Paul, that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God"; a couple of texts which I might supplement with numbers of others to the same effect. In fact, the whole conception of the spiritual body and the spiritual state is in point-blank opposition to the Paradise of the Koran.

3. Mohammed inculcated the spread of his religion by force. The true believers were enjoined to use the sword for its propagation. This is absolutely contradictory to the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles, and to the whole spirit of the New Testament.

4. "The true believers" of the Koran are on such a point of superiority to all other men, that the oath of an unbeliever is of no weight against the word of a

true believer. This is absolutely against the whole spirit of the New Testament, and against the practice of almost all Christendom in former ages, against the practice of all Christendom now.

5. The relations between the sexes are, in Mohammedanism, those between superior and inferior beings; in Christianity, those between equals.

6. Slavery is not only not forbidden, and recognised in the Koran; it is thoroughly approved of and organised. I am quite aware that mercy is recommended, and often (by no means always) practised. But there is no provision for securing mercy, beyond its being recommended.

Finally, I must notice the strange misconception in Canon Taylor's paper, which regards Mohammedanism as a kind of *preparation* for Christianity. It is a *retrogression* from Christianity, a step backwards, which yet declares itself as a step forwards. Hence the all but impossibility of converting Mohammedans. They have been accustomed to consider themselves as far in advance of Christians. Nor can I recollect one single expression in the Koran which would seem to intimate that Mohammed recognised in Christ one higher than himself. Being essentially nothing but a man, according to his doctrine, Christ must have been inferior to him who came with a subsequent and fresh revelation.

I have long felt surprised at the exaggerated praise lavished on Mohammedanism by persons who, I think, cannot know much either of the Koran or of the history of its conquests. The fashion was set by Carlyle, who has had too many followers. The Koran on the one hand, and the *real* Arabian Nights on the other, are quite enough to dissipate their illusions.

C. P. M.

November 16th, 1887.

◆

IF THESE THINGS BE DONE IN THE GREEN TREE, WHAT WILL BE DONE IN THE DRY?

SIR,—Will you allow me to give you a picture of Irish Church life? *Your* time also may come.

In the summer a member of our General Synod brought forward the open Popery of our Church paper. He would not be heard, because the paper was of no authority. One of our Bishops has now recognised it as "an Organ of our Church," and the paper has called on all our other Bishops to add their voices to his.

2. It was disheartening that our Synod would not entertain the question of the Popery of a Church paper. But within the last week or so, we have had cause for comfort. Popery is as hateful to our Synod as it is possible to be. Let the matter only come before it regularly, and we shall see what we shall see. The occasion which proves my point is a melancholy one, though from it we can derive comfort.

3. A Catechism has had the favour of the Synod. This Catechism asserts that the priest only can pronounce absolution; and that whoso intrudes on this office sins after the manner of Korah, etc. An immense majority of the Diocesan Synod of Dublin, Kildare, etc., not only denied that the Catechism was imposed upon schools, but also denied that priests have any more authority to absolve than laymen, or that those who intrude on the office sin after the example of Korah. This is as lamentable as anything can be, and contradicts every formulary which bears upon the subject.

4. But yet from this false decision I derive the comfort that Romanism and Ritualism are so odious to our clergy and laity that whenever Popish local presence and adoration thereof are fairly before the Synod they will get such a reception as they did when our Reformers were burnt, rather than give them allowance. If our Synods were thrown into excitement at the unfounded idea that we uphold a Popish absolution; if it was convulsed because we maintain that absolution is a power committed by Christ to some, and that it is a presumption for any one else to assume it—if this put them into a No-Popery furore, what will be the effect on our excitable Protestant members, when the real state of things is laid before them? Of the effect, Sir, you and your readers may judge when I tell you what the tale is, which will then be unfolded.—T. C. D. has a guild for students, which, we are told, inculcates clerical celibacy and compulsory regular private confession.—There is a theological society in which at a meeting, in presence of the two Professors of Divinity, an essay was read stating plain transubstantiation. T. C. D. makes no sign! But this is not all. An incumbent died lately. His body lay in state, tapers burning on either side, day and night. Holy Eucharist offered daily for repose. Did this offend congregation or vestry, nominators or diocesan? Far from it! The officiator was rewarded by appointment to the parish. Our only weekly Church paper asserts a local presence of our Lord's body in ninety places at once, and that this and adoration thereof may be lawfully held and observed within our Communion. In its columns the Black Rubric is held up to scorn, without rebuke from the editor. This has gone on for months. No appeals can produce retractation. Objectors are shut out and abused, and the editor boasts of approbation and subscribers from your side of the water. This is the paper that one of our bishops applauds as of "moderate tone," and the editor calls upon the rest of our bishops to say the same. Now, Sir, wait till all this comes before a Synod which objects to one man absolving more than another; wait till all this Popery is exposed, and we shall see such a scene as we never had since the days of Mary and Elizabeth, when Popery was openly discussed in your Convocations. If these things were done in the green tree, what will be done in the dry?

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

◆

WASTED MILLIONS AND SINECURES.—The Committee on the Army and Navy Estimates has published General Brackenbury's evidence as a separate paper, for it is evidence that deserves to be studied by every taxpayer. We have 179 Generals, and of these 109 are unemployed. All these unemployed Generals are on half-pay, and their respective rates of pay are—£500 a year for Major-Generals, £650 for Lieutenant-Generals, and £800 for full Generals. Between them these six full Generals, thirty-three Lieutenant-Generals, and seventy Major-Generals unemployed receive £62,000 a year, and this exclusive of the Retired List. Contrast this state of things with that in Germany. There no General Officers are unemployed. In Germany a man is never promoted to be a General Officer until there is employment for a General Officer vacant. But then in Germany they get value for their money. The difference in the rate of pay may be gathered from a single fact. The Commander-in-Chief of our Army draws £6,600 per annum. General von Moltke gets £1,500. The non-effective service of the German Army costs £2,225,000 per annum, ours £3,085,000. The effective force of the German Army costs £19,369,453; the effective force of our Army, excluding charges that ought properly to be in the Navy Estimates, £14,600,000. For her nineteen millions, Germany gets nineteen *corps d'armée*, of 37,000 men each. Our Army, in proportion to its numerical strength, is *seven times* as costly as any Continental Army. It would be something if it were efficient; but, from General Wolseley downwards, those who are entitled to speak with authority, whilst praising the *personnel*, insist that the organisation is incomplete in every direction, and incomplete because enough money is not spent upon it. Paradoxical as it may sound, that is true. The millions are frittered away upon non-efficients, extravagant establishments, excessive emoluments to favoured individuals, so that it comes about that, with a net expenditure within £7,000,000 of that of the German Empire, we have not ready to hand a single army corps, whilst Germany has nineteen.—*The Echo.*

THE election to the Disney Professorship of Archæology at Cambridge is fixed for November 30th, and that to the Hulsean Professorship of Divinity for Saturday next: in the former case the heads of houses are the electing body, in the latter the Divinity Professors, the Masters of Trinity and St. John's, and the Professor of Greek. The electors to the Disney Professorship are at liberty to appoint any qualified person, whether he has been a candidate for the post or not; the Hulsean Professorship is said to have attracted a very large field; rumour alleges that a Dean, the head of a theological college, a King's College professor, a former professor at Lampeter, and five of the younger men who are closely associated with divinity teaching at the present time, have offered themselves for the post; the selection may be a matter of great difficulty, but it will certainly be facilitated if the electors give a strict interpretation to the statute under which they act and endeavour to carry out the purposes of Mr. Hulse's foundation. His purpose was not to promote the critical study of the Bible, nor to endow a chair of pastoral theology, but to encourage the study and diffuse a knowledge of apologetics. The Christian advocate was to devote himself to answering objections, especially objections recently published in English, against the Christian faith, not devoting himself to the "particular" differences among Christians themselves, though he might advert to the errors of Papists and Methodists, and he was to publish a treatise so that his studies might be available for the world at large. Mr. Hulse's original design has undergone many modifications, some for the better and some for the worse, as when the number of lectures to be delivered in connection with the foundation was reduced a second time, and from eight to four; but when the University abolished the office of Christian advocate and created a professorship instead, they retained a precise restriction as to the special subject with which this professor should deal, while they re-imposed the obligation to publish. The Commissioners, however, gave a farther relaxation by dropping a clause which explicitly limited the professor's work to apologetics and apologetics only, though he is still required to publish lectures at intervals. The professorship thus has a very special character still, and some of those who might be qualified to undertake other branches of divinity teaching are not specially fitted to carry out the purposes of Mr. Hulse's foundation and lecture on apologetics, with reference not only to the requirements of students here, but of the public at large.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Ash, Rev. Cyril Alfred Drummond, B.A., Chaplain of Tyntesfield Chapel, Wraxall.
Atkinson, Rev. Henry William, LL.B.; Rector of West Compton Abbas, Dorchester.
Best, Rev. J. D., M.A., Senior Curate of Wellingborough; Principal of the Training College for Mistresses at Derby.
Bonney, Rev. Dr., Honorary Canon of Manchester Cathedral.
Bragge, Rev. Charles Albert, M.A., Vicar of Thorncombe; Rural Dean of Lyme Portion.
Brickwood, Rev. William, B.A., Rector of Toddington, Beds.
Briddon, Rev. W. H., Curate (Sole Charge) of Hixon, near Stafford.
Chamberlain, Rev. William Barnes, Curate of Ossett; Consular Chaplain at Monte Video, South America.
Cleary, Rev. Augustus Castle, Perpetual Curate of the Chapel of Ease, Boston.
Cockshott, Rev. W. E., M.A., formerly Curate of St. Stephen's, Norwich; Chaplain to H.M. Legation at Athens.
Crawley, Rev. Charles David, M.A., Rector of Allington, Wilts.
Crosse, Rev. Edward Ilbert, M.A., Vicar of Long Wittingham, Berks.
Dovey, Rev. W., Rector of Llansannor, near Cowbridge.
Dunlop. Rev. C. Stuart, Vicar of Henfield, Sussex.
Festing, Rev. J. W., Vicar of Christ Church, Albany Street Rural Dean of St. Pancras.
Fetherston, Rev. Sir George Ralph, Bart., Curate of St. Mary's, Tenby; Vicar of Pydeltrenthide, Dorsetshire.
Hodgson, Rev. Tom Dowson, Vicar of Christ Church, Cockermouth.
Jones, Rev. Maurice, B.A., Assistant District Secretary (Welsh) to the Society for Promoting the Employment of Additional Curates for the Western District.
Kealey, Rev. Arthur Graham, Chaplain in Her Majesty's Fleet.
Littlewood, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Ixworth, Suffolk; Vicar of Fordend, Great Waltham.
Lumby, Rev. J. Rawson, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of York; Prebendary of Wetwang in York Cathedral.
Metcalfe, Rev. Francis James, Rector of Killamarsh, Derbyshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Davis, Rev. Thomas, M.A., for forty-eight years Incumbent of Roundhay, Leeds, on the 11th inst., aged 83.
Dowling, Rev. Barré Beresford, M.A., formerly Curate of St. Thomas, Winchester, for twenty-three years Rector of the parish, suddenly, at Chilton Rectory, Alresford, on the 7th inst., aged 59.
Falcon-Steward, Rev. Robert Steward, late Rector of Sulhamstead, at Newton Manor, on the 9th inst., aged 58.
Fisher, Rev. Harry Charrington, Rector of Chaldon, at Brighton, on the 8th inst., aged 55.
Hulbert, Rev. Bertram Brooke, at Falmouth, on the 5th inst., aged 62.
Hutchinson, Rev. Cyril George, late Rector of Batsford, and Hon. Canon of Gloucester, at 26, Royal Crescent, Bath, on the 2nd inst., aged 87.
Mathewson, Rev. John, late Curate of Singleton, at Brookhouse, Chailey, on the 8th inst., aged 27.
Potter, Rev. Lewis Francis, Rector, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, after a few days' illness, on the 6th inst., aged 57.
Weston, Rev. G. F., for forty years Vicar of Crosby Ravensworth, Rural Dean of Lowther, and Hon. Canon of Carlisle, on the 14th inst., aged 68.
Whyte, Rev. William Athoney, of St. Barnabas, New South Wales, at Sydney, on the 4th ult., aged 49.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE MARIAN CULTUS.

By the Rev. PHILIP DWYER, M.A.

Sermon Preached in Scrayingham Church, York, on Sunday, March 13th, 1887.

> "While He yet talked to the people, behold, His mother and His brethren stood without, desiring to speak with Him. Then one said unto Him, Behold, Thy mother and Thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with Thee. But He answered and said unto him that told Him, Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? And He stretched forth His hand toward His disciples and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father, which is in Heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."—Matt. xii. 46, etc.

ANOTHER incident very like to this is recorded by St. Luke as taking place on the same occasion. "A certain woman of the company lifted up her voice and said unto him, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked.'" The like reply is given by the Lord, "Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." Again, St. Luke records a third, or it may be only this second of the interviews with our Lord, proposed on the part of his family, but with the special feature noted "that they could not come at him for the crowd" (Luke viii. 19). Having all these occurrences, questions, and answers laid before us with such evident purpose of special instruction and exact guidance, we are bound to make careful inquiry into what are the objects aimed at, and to ascertain what may be the duties, even also the dangers arising by the way to those who would draw near to God through Christ, and lift up their souls in faith, and love, and humble service, "unto God in the Heavens"—in fact, to Christian people, as such, in their highest spiritual relations.

1. Everything needful for us to know is exactly stated concerning the birth and circumcision of Jesus Christ, who "was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the king." Of his early life a studied silence is observed in the genuine gospels. Spurious gospels a long time after were fabricated, supplying incidents of a romantic nature, addressed to feelings of a sentimental cast. The first authentic incident of His child-life relates to His being left behind in the Temple, and to what came of it. The remonstrance of His mother is just motherly (that is to say), at once sad and tender. He soars in His reply to the mysterious heights of His innate Majesty, and urges the pressing claims of His all-absorbing mission. And so He asks in wonder, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business"? And although "they understood not the saying," yet He quietly "went down to Nazareth," and it is recorded especially, "was subject to them." And it is significantly added, "His mother kept all these sayings in her heart."

2. The second time in which this mother and this Son are recorded to have met was at the marriage of Cana in Galilee. "The mother of Jesus" (mark the phrase) "was there, and both Jesus was called and His disciples to the marriage." The mother, with best intentions, interferes. The Son firmly, yet gently declines—insists on no interference, and asserts his own perfect freedom and undivided right of action, saying, "Woman" (dame or lady as we would mean), "what have I to do with thee, mine hour is not yet come." We shall notice these words once more.

3. Here again in our text, is the third recorded occasion of an approach of mother and Son. What do we find? First occurs an interruption, "as He spake these things," concerning the dangers of religious indifference, illustrated so awfully in the case of the relapsed demoniac—the words are broken in upon by the uplifted voice of "the woman in the company," using those words we have given already. Now, what relevancy or fitness had the antecedents and parentage, even on the mother's side, of Him who so spake, with the subject matter put forward by Him? Who can see any when Jesus saw none, "But He said, yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it," instead of relapsing, or romancing about it. At the same time, who can forget another event, narrated by an eye-witness? "Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost, and she spake out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb; and whence is this that the mother of my Lord should come unto me." Now here is much that is common to these two women, Elizabeth and her "in the company," viz., nearly the same expressions, quite the same vehemence in utterance, the facts the same, the inferences in neither case unwarrantable or unnatural; as issuing from the enraptured hearts of admiring womanhood. And yet, there are two items of difference between them very sharply drawn. She who was filled with the Holy Ghost and so spake, dwelt upon "the fruit of thy womb," as "blessed" (that is to say), dwelt upon the Son of this mother. She who was filled and overflowed with an unsanctified sentimentalism, dwelt upon "the womb that bare Him," as "blessed" (that is to say), upon the mother of this Son. And now we reach the case of Mary herself, a case worthy of all the care and reverence at command, one tells the Lord Jesus, "Behold Thy mother and Thy brethren stand without, desiring or seeking to speak to Thee." Was there any harm in the thing itself, if the

mother and the brethren seemed desirous (which may be not uncharitably supposed), of a public recognition and of having the whole family uniting in happy exultation over the success achieved by the great "prophet of Nazareth." Can any be stolid enough to maintain that mothers with their loving embraces do not become as divinities to the developing consciousness of their babes? Can any maintain again that the mothers of great men are not thereby made great themselves—and deservedly so—fountains as they so often are of their highest powers and noblest qualities, fashioning too their hearts (as they above all others can), in the ways of piety and purity, of nobility and gentleness? Surely none can forget Monica the mother of Augustine. And indeed, generally speaking (and we thank God for this), we may well feel sure that the mother at whose knees we lisped out our first prayers, is the most successful and blessed missionary that ever went forth to exalt, reform, and evangelise mankind. So far of things, as they conform to the standard of our ordinary ways of thinking and feeling. But then (even though all this may hold good), a far more complex problem is ours to solve. There are to be weighed and measured the mutual relations of this mother and Son—the latter now in his manhood. There is also, outside and above this, something far higher, and exercising a dominant influence upon our Lord in respect of His ministry. Still, for all this, we may well feel sure that as Peter denied his Master, so will not Jesus deny His mother. Again, as Jesus ever had the highest respect and a profound love for His mother, we may again feel sure that so He will now act, and as He knew for certain that she had all the same for Him, to the very overflowing of her heart, so He will not run counter to this. He will not inflict upon her a moment's cloud of suspicion or a passing chill of coldness. This also we take for certain. But again, as He stood in so high a relation towards "His Father in Heaven"—these sublime relations, also those of "His Father's business," which aforetime He had mentioned to His mother—must be considered as a potent factor in his motives and in his actions on every occasion.

All we can determine, then, is this, that the love and the wisdom, the gentleness and judgment of Jesus will reconcile all requirements in the very "bond of perfectness." The mother as a mother shall meet with no rude repulse, the mother as a Christian shall receive everything calculated to forward the end and aim of a being like her, so humble and holy, and of such spirituality of mind, that it was filled with Scripture lore, and overflowed in heavenly strains of poetic praise. But when, besides all this, we come to search the face of the narrative, we find there is given to us no positive and certain information, whether (the difficulty of the thronging crowd being got over), she and the brethren did on the occasion actually "speak with Jesus," or did not so "speak." If they did not, as some may think, then this was the second occasion in which Jesus did not acquiesce in the requests made by Mary, "the mother of Jesus." But on the other hand, if they did succeed and speak with Him, the principle on which "the mother and brethren" may have been admitted to the privilege of approach and speech, will be found, not restricted to any mere natural relationship, according to what was proposed, but (as in the case of Abraham's children), found solely due to the kinship of faith, and a relationship common to "a seed" that is numerous as the sands on the sea-shore, and bright as the stars in the arch of Heaven.

4. Only once again, we may say the fourth time, do we find the mother of Jesus near to Him on earth. John, an eye-witness, records the event (chap. xix. 25): "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus His mother, and His mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore" (looking down from the cross), "saw His mother, and the disciple standing by, whom He loved, He said unto His mother, Woman, behold thy Son! Then saith He to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her to his own home." Here is no divergence of opinion, no discrepancy of thought, no lack of thorough mutual accord, but all is blessed, loving fusion of souls, the giving originating from Him, the receiving now her's without request. While "the sword is piercing her own heart" with edge of sharpened agony, she is pointed for her vast comfort (in beholding the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world), now to behold her own Son as this Lamb, and thus, she most of all needing comfort because of the cross, is most of all sustained with comforts by means of the cross. The God of all grace thereby fulfilling His own words, "He maketh sore and bindeth up, He woundeth, and His hands make whole." And how all this must in after days have reminded her, while "pondering in her heart" as her custom was, of how well she had worded her own faith, as a sinner under the load of guilt taking refuge and finding shelter in Christ and His atoning blood, when she made that adaptation of Hannah's song, "My soul doth magnify the Lord and my spirit hath rejoiced in God *my Saviour*." And here, too, as consulting for her soul's health and salvation, so not the less tenderly mindful of the requirements due to her temporal condition, and (even as one may say), of her domestic well-being, our Lord makes a good and wise provision in all things for his mother. And thus it was, that at the close of their earthly meetings, all between them both was "love without torment," all light, save for dimness of her flowing tears, and all peace but for the struggles of her throbbing heart.

5. Once more, and but incidentally, is mention made of Mary. Expecting the promise of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles returned to Jerusalem, and as we read in Acts i. 14, "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with the brethren." These two latter parties are no longer "standing without desirous to see Him" (minded on the matter as before), only desirous were they now to contemplate in humble faith, and to worship from afar Jesus as their ascended and glorified Lord and Master, and possess the gift of His blessed Spirit. Of all else revelation is silent. This ends the inspired and revealed life of "Mary the mother of Jesus," here at the close and in the progress of the Gospel narrative, only so called, while the designations such as "highly favoured," "blessed among women" and of "all generations to be called blessed," are confined exclusively to its opening pages and earlier events. And may we not in view of the usual, indeed, normal course of * mythical progression mark this as a divinely pre-arranged antidote and intentional reversal of the tendency. May we not also learn another weighty and decisive lesson concerning the mutual relations of Jesus and of Mary, from the facts already under review? Only four times is she presented upon the stage of affairs, subsequent to the mission and manhood of Jesus, and here twice the independence of His relation to her as a worker of miracles and a "teacher sent from God" is traced out clearly; twice again, her dependence on Him is also traced in living lines; first on the cross, as "the propitiation for (her) sins," and then on the throne as her "Advocate with the Father." She humbly taking her place among the brethren, instead of standing apart in high official dignity, as Queen of Heaven designate.

Thus, while intense admiration and high emotion of soul are drawn out towards Him, ever more and more, as the facts warrant them, anything in the soul that might be mis-directed towards her, or grow to excess, receives no countenance whatsoever, but much to the contrary. Indeed, concerning the two great forerunners of Jesus Christ, the one of His manhood, the other of His mission, the same thing is true in fact, and the same as a needs-be is also clothed in words of their own very using: "He must increase, but I must decrease," exclaims the self-forgetting, self-denying Baptist. "He hath exalted the humble and meek," re-echoes the gentle and thoughtful "mother of Jesus."

6. Now, if we do but choose to reflect calmly and fairly upon all this, and in particular upon our Lord's words, both to the woman in the crowd and to His mother and brethren, we must perceive, that as duties, so equally dangers, are to be found before us as Christians while we discharge the highest acts of religion and lift up our souls in noblest aspiration heavenward. While "worshipping in spirit and truth," we make our table a snare and the things that should have been for our peace an occasion of falling. We may yield to feelings at the expense of faith; mistake means for an end, and following too much the devices and desires of our own hearts, prefer the self-willed offerings of a sympathetic excitement starting aside, above the simplicity of a homage that flies direct to its mark.

7. And the importance of this distinction will find yet another solid basis of support, if we reflect upon the manner in which the first promise of a Saviour, made after the fall of man, has been dealt with. While the language is guarded strictly against any leading away of men's minds or hearts beforehand from aught that may properly concern "the seed of the woman," so as to rest upon "the woman" herself; yet even this precaution is reversed and a misleading issue forecasted. "It shall bruise thy (the serpent's) head" is the translation of the Hebrew verity in our Authorised Version of Genesis iii. 15. The Revised Version adheres to this *verbatim*. The Greek of the LXX. makes it equal to "He shall bruise thy head." And St. Paul, re-echoing the principle, writes "God shall shortly bruise Satan under thy feet." But, the Latin Vulgate, the version adopted by a world-wide Church, makes the words to run, "*She* shall bruise thy head," and so their English Bibles follow suit. Another perversion is too glaring to escape.* If an undesigned honour was forced upon Mary, instead of her Son in Genesis, a well-deserved repulse is warded off from her in John. "Woman, what is that to me and thee?" is the Douay translation of John ii. 4, instead of ' What have I to do with thee" in ours. The absurdity of supposing that our Lord would say to His mother, when trying to interest Him about the straits in which the hospitable entertainers were placed by an unexpected increase of guests (the increase perhaps being caused by our Lord's presence); the absurdity of supposing Him to make the unfeeling answer, "What is that to us?" Why, it would only equal that of the priests to Judas, "What is that to us, see thou to that" (which rugged expressions of repulse, by the way, are clothed in the form of a quite different Greek idiom). Thus the mis-translation is monstrous.

---

* As an illustration of this a reference is made to Barth's "Religions of India," where, in the introduction, the following appears: "The old religions founded on nature-worship present a continuous, self-determined development, in the course of which, instead of contracting, they have continued to enlarge their borders."

* And while St. Paul draws out in many particulars a marked analogy between the first Adam and the second, a most studious silence is observed with regard to any analogy whatsoever between Eve and Mary. This latter is purely gratuitous and comes from the dreamland of "the woman in the company," and the development of equally fanciful ecclesiastics.

But absurdity ends not here. In both Testaments we have thirteen other texts in the same form as that before us. Every one of these the Vulgate translates in the same manner, in order to countenance its manipulation of this one in John, adopted in order to blot out our Lord's rebuke of His mother's interference. How monstrous all these mis-translations are I now show by two instances. The widow of Zarephath, pleading for her dead son, is made to say, "*Quid mihi et tibi*," or "What concern to us is my son's death?" Can absurdity exceed this? When Abishai wanted leave to kill the cursing Shimei, David says, "What have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruiah?" This the Vulgate makes nonsense of by translating, "*Quid mihi et vobis*," or "What is it to me and you?" One could go through all the thirteen places and show how, for the sake of John ii. 4, they are all made unintelligible. But lo and behold! though the Vulgate was declared of equal authority with the original by Pope Sixtus, yet now in the Douay of 1882, every one of these texts is changed so as to agree with our Version; while John ii. 4, is left mis-translated still to save the honour and glory of the Virgin, demonstrating plainly that to serve her exaltation the Word of God must be sacrificed. The passages referred to are: Joshua xxii. 24, Judges xi. 12, 2 Sam. xvi. 10, 1 Kings xvii. 18, 2 Kings ix. 19, Ezra iv. 3, Hosea xiv. 9, Joel iii. 4, Matt. viii. 29, xxvii. 19, Mark i. 24, v. 7, Luke iv. 34, viii. 28.

8. Thus we have a duty to do—the grave duty of self-defence against a serious danger on a most critical occasion. And if we may in this seem to judge others, let it be with the judgment of charity; ourselves we must deal with in the judgment of severity, in a case, too, where so much depends upon the issue. The force of the impulse that opened the mouth of "the woman in the company," that prompted the natural affection of those nearest and dearest to Jesus, to seek Him that they might show off His importance and find His glories reflected back upon themselves (and worse than this, by far, if we can persuade ourselves that they actually waited upon Him as a deputation, in order to silence Him); all this must be estimated as ever kindling within, ever likely to arise in our hearts, ever likely to distract, even divert us from Jesus. And just then most of all do this, when we are brought into nearest contact with Him, and having our emotional faculties raised into a Heaven-seeking flame.' Now here the corruption of the best becomes the worst, and the extent to which this very principle has been carried out in our modern religious life has become one of the most marked and overt of its specialities and dangers.

9. This principle of our impulsive emotional excitement as the grand desideratum, and one almost anyhow to be stirred up in our modern expression of religion, has taken a high place, and constitutes a leading instance in the application of the law of demand and supply, as acting and reacting mutually. Whatever may be the ultimate effect upon art itself, owing to its extensive application towards the purposes of modern religious development, one thing is clear, and it is the fact that this application is extensively made. The principle under review has enlisted the active agency and drawn forth the elaborate efforts, and can point to the highest flights and noblest triumphs of modern genius, achieved among a host of poets, composers, musicians, sculptors, architects, and it has subsidised innumerable departments of minor artistic skill and talent. This principle is the central feature of a very popular *cultus*, and the mainspring in the devotions of millions of its votaries, not only in "the Church of Rome, but also of Constantinople." To dwell on all this is no joy. To omit the scrutiny of it is to keep back what is profitable, nay, urgently needing to be generally known. And accordingly now only two main items of this system and of its results, as bearing upon a whole-hearted and undivided allegiance to "the Lord and His Christ," can be presented. First, in reference to dogma. The position is this: holding the creed of the Catholic Church, we believe in "Jesus Christ conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," and infer from this that "Christ alone is without sin." And yet we find that within some twenty-five years the "Immaculate Conception of the blessed Virgin Mary" has for the first time been imposed on Christendom as an article of faith necessary to salvation. Again, we believe that Jesus Christ "suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried." And yet, as a parallel, the popular figment is obtruded of "the seven dolors of Mary." And this, like the former notion, may crystallise ere long (for all that we can see to the contrary) into another Article of Faith. And then, to crown all and eclipse all, we find that while the Catholic faith believes of Jesus Christ that He "ascended into Heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God," we find it further set forth in manuals innumerable, and celebrated by festal days of special honour and obligation, that there has been an "Assumption of the blessed Virgin into heaven, and her glorification as Queen,"* with a corresponding outcome of results arising from this in joy and in duty among them that are so persuaded. Indeed, the month of May, once dedicated among certain heathens to Maia, is now among certain Christians dedicated to Mary. Then again, secondly, in respect of devotion and at once an incentive and advertisement, paintings and statuary are extensively brought into play. Whether these may equal or exceed the *spirantia æra* of Greek art, let judges of art decide. Anyhow, we find two main typical designs selected. The one is a tender infant held in the

---

* See Jeremiah vii., and the Collyridian system.

arms of a stately gentle matron, benign of aspect, spirituelle in form and grace, as art at its present best is able to execute. The other is the star-crowned Queen of Heaven, radiant in glory, and fascinating in her effulgence of inexhaustible graciousness. Is it not, therefore, for us a matter of unspeakable consequence to make sure how far all these ideas, all these seals of characteristic impress, all these far-reaching forces of direction, impulse, and emotion now at work in our midst (for such they assuredly are, and so it is), may interfere with our devotions to Jesus, may disaffect, paralyse, or even divert our hearts and put a coercive strain upon our allegiance to "our Lord" as "Prophet, Priest, and King," and the "one Mediator." If we are to approach Him, as a weak Babe, accessible only through His sweet Mother, or, for our only other indicated choice, as an awful Judge, made placable through her august mediation and tender mercies—most certainly all this is very dangerous because very attractive to many dispositions, and near akin to that sentimental excitement of "the woman in the company who lifted up her voice" under a resistless rapture in eulogy of an unsanctified extravagance.

10. To defend and support all, or even a part, of this Marian *cultus*, or any modification of it, by citing the case of Bathsheba, to whom King Solomon, her son, said, "Ask on, my mother, I will not say thee nay" (1 Kings ii. 20); or by the case of Ahazuerus yielding to "the petition of Esther the Queen"—is worse than useless, unless only to demonstrate the utter desperation of those who have nothing stronger to cite out of Scripture than the proceedings of Eastern potentates in their frivolous, corrupt, and cruel courts, as if, forsooth, the patterns and parallels of the heavenly worship of decent Christian people. Nor is the case made more credible by calling down the beauteous vision to St. John, "who saw a great wonder in Heaven, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." But this is not the mother. This is the spouse of Jesus Christ—His bride, His Church, beloved but tried, afflicted but victorious, "made war upon by the dragon in his wrath against herself and against her seed, which keep the commandments of God (mark these words), and have the testimony of Jesus Christ" (Rev xii.).

11. And if, to the discouragement and destitution of proof which this system encounters in any attempt at a Scriptural sanction, as well as the obviously "deceitful handling of the word of God" attempted to prop it up, we may add the experience of the Church and the testimony of history,—then the vast importance of what it involved will stand out in bold relief, and its urgency "lift up a voice" of just alarm. What, then, find we noted in "The Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury," at vol. i., p. 23: "Many grave errors originated in customs that were at first countenanced by wise and good men, for the sake of their practical utility. The Church of England, as we shall see, united with the Gallican and Roman Churches in denouncing under the teaching of Alcuin and the authority of Charlemagne all image worship, even after it had been openly sanctioned at Rome. No one was stronger in his denunciations of image worship than Gregory the Great. But he permitted, and so did the divines of Frankfort, the use of images as historical memorials, and in an ignorant age the subtle explanations of a learned few were unable to stop the progress of superstition. The same thing occurred with regard to saint worship." And if the experience of the last fifty years is piled upon that of a thousand years ago, we shall see that the strong tendency, in a degree scarcely exceeded since Augustine's mission, is evidently to run in the way of materialising worship more and more, and of our national Church sinking into the servile copyist of mediæval usages, and of adopting one after another the specialities of Roman and Greek Church impositions. This also comes to light in particular in the desire beginning to be manifested, to erect images of the blessed Virgin and of the Child Jesus as ornaments of English churches, but only for architectural decoration, it is said. And yet, if "all images in churches were ordered to be destroyed at the Reformation period, as being so likely to become abused to superstitious uses,"* what is there to make them less so now, and in particular those "of which idolatry has proved an almost inseparable accident"? or why venture at all in this direction? As to this second query, one might understand that if the Church of England, in doing due honour to Jesus, had failed of due respect for "the blessed Virgin Mary," one might naturally expect some colourable pretext being advanced to favour such a reaction. But when one looks at the terms used as above in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England at her name or mention in the three Creeds, remembers also that there are two holy days appointed, one for "the purification," the other "for the Annunciation of the blessed Virgin Mary," and estimates aright the general spirit of fair play towards her, especially in the use of her "song" after the Second Lesson in "The Order for Evening Prayer daily throughout the year"—there is not the slightest occasion for reaction on

---

* The 3rd and 4th of Edward VI., c. 10 (A.D. 1550), which was opposed by six Bishops (see Burnett, "History of Reformation," II. i. 249), abolished Antient Office-books and Images as church ornaments on the express ground "lest they should be a hindrance to the Prayer-book of late set forth by the authority of Parliament." And the offences, moreover, were to be tried before the Justices. Nothing could exceed the impudence of attempting in this session of Parliament to repeal this Act, and make it cease to be in force as become unnecessary. Nothing would justify the agitation and exposure of the Marian *cultus* more completely.

such grounds as deficiency of just respect. The claim is an impudent falsehood, indeed, for anything of the sort. And as to the first query of doubt, namely, the decreased danger, we cannot recognise any such thing as a reality. For just as they who first worshipped the supreme powers in the stars *per sacella*, that is to say, as their glittering shrines, ended with worshipping the stars, as if these were the supreme powers themselves; so here, again, beginning far below the "most High," men will end far below the point where they began. And how long this process of deterioration of worship may take to become complete, will matter little indeed, when the same result is so sure to ensue. And if "there was in the first ages no public and ecclesiastical recognition of the place which Saint Mary holds in the economy of grace";* and if "this was reserved for the fifth century, as the definition of our Lord's divinity had been of the fourth"; all this is confessedly due, "not to Scripture, but to development." And besides, a comparison is made of things that differ as widely as God's revealings and man's devisings. And experience and history alike point out the extreme danger and impolicy of using images (even supposed not in the first instance used idolatrously), but only as books of the rude, memorials of history, and highly stimulating incentives to devotion. And it would be an extremely rash and precarious mode of argument, were we led to conclude that, if the symbols of Marian *cultus* are once set up in our churches during this nineteenth century, there will take five centuries or one century before the worship of Mary will be in full swing in our midst. And all this also must be weighed in the face of the facts which have been exhibited within the last fifty years of extraordinary retrograde changes in our midst. As for there being no danger from the Marian *cultus* or symbols being set up, because this is an enlightened age, no more is there a necessity for their exhibition at all in such an age. And we must now press upon your attention the experience of the last fifteen years in this same Marian *cultus*, in order that you may rightly measure the extent of its dangers, from the power and effects of its attractions. The following account of the Ober Ammergau Passion play appeared in a well-known magazine in October, 1871. The writer "doubts if Protestantism has sufficiently pondered the fact that the religions which have signally reached and won the hearts of the poor, have been those which Apotheosised the feminine element. The human heart must pass from the adoration of Isis, Minerva, Ceres, Bertha, and Mary. But the love-principle has not perished with the forms which represented this or that phase of its evolution. And the great faith which shall in the future unite all hearts must reveal in all fulness that divine love with which the Bavarian peasant has invested the heavenly woman, whom he adores far more than the majestic Jehovah, or even the official and princely Christ. The play draws the heart to Mary rather than to Christ. He is the Imperial Being, with no touch of humanity but the fleshly form." Here we only remark that if a system like this combines (as it evidently does combine) the subtle vitality of an epidemic, with the easy diffusiveness of a contagion, and to crown and consummate both, finds for certain encounter a strong constitutional or innate tendency predisposing to the taking of the disorder—are we not very inconsistent—utterly senseless, indeed—if when repelling pleuro-pneumonia from our herds and the plague from our homes, we have anything whatsoever to do with introducing or permitting the earliest incitements of such a spiritual peril, of such a wanton "leading into temptation," to be spread abroad in our midst, or exposed to general gaze even in remote connection with our Christian system. In a case like this, the beginning is half.

12. One thing only now remains to be done. We must complete the demonstration that in the religion of Jesus Christ, nothing (absolutely nothing) exists to sanction or countenance this Marian *cultus*, or the fond fancies from which it starts, or the taking shows by which it is kept going and gathering sway. On the contrary, we shall see how emphatically He condemns, and how clearly He declares, that all this springs from an unsanctified sentimentalism, and hurries forward into the violation of fundamental duties to God, when once it gets footing in a church, and becomes the fashion of an age.

When Jesus was charged with coming "to destroy the law and the prophets," He indignantly repelled the imputation, and declared "that He came to fulfil," and added a woe hot and heavy to fall on those "who should break one of the least of these (ten) commandments, and teach men so." We must accordingly take the first and second of the "ten words of God," and reflect on what a learned modern writer* discourses upon them; also study the references he (as a Hebrew specialist) gave, in proof "It is not enough to acknowledge Jehovah as the only God (Exod. xx. 3, Deut. v. 7, Isaiah xlii. 8). He must be adored under no visible form whatever, not by any image, figure, or likeness, whether of man or woman, of beast or bird, of fish or reptile (Deut. iv. 16-18; compare 25, v. 28, Exodus xx. 4, Isaiah xl. 18, xlvi. 5), because the people, when communing with God at Horeb, had only heard a voice, but seen no figure (Deut. iv. 12-15, *cp.* Exod. xx. 18-21). Moreover, nearly all the manifold forms of idolatry which prevailed among the heathen in the author's times, or had been practised by them in former periods, were individually interdicted — the worship of the heavenly bodies, of sun, moon, and stars (Deut. iv. 19, xvii. 3, Levit. xxvi. 30); of Ashtartè (Deut. xvi. 21), with her licentious service (Levit. xix. 29, Deut. xxiii. 18, 19, *cp.* 1 Kings xxii. 47, 2 Kings xxiii. 7); and of the animals held sacred by the Egyptians (Levit. xvii. 7, xviii. 3, Deut. xxxii. 17); the worship in high places (Levit. xxvi. 30, Ezek. vi. 3, xx. 29); and the sanction of altars and images, statues and memorial stones for idolatrous purposes (Exod. xx. 23, Levit. xix. 4, xxvi. 1, Deut. xvi. 22); while their absolute destruction wherever they should be found (Exod. xxiii. 24, xxxiv. 13, Numbers xxxiii. 52, Deut. vii. 5, xii. 2 and 3, *cp.* Isaiah xxvii. 9, 2 Kings xviii. 4, xxiii. 24), was commanded with such uncompromising severity, that not even the gold and silver with which they were made and adorned were allowed to be used, but were to be detested, like a curse and an abomination (Deut. vii. 25, 26; Isaiah xxx. 22). Nay, the Canaanite tribes themselves were to be extirpated, and all alliances with them scrupulously shunned lest they should seduce the Hebrews to adopt their gods and their superstitions (Exod. xxiii. 32 and 33, Deut. vii. 2, iv. 24, xx. 16-18; *cp.* Exod. xvii. 14, and 1 Sam. xv. 2 and 3)." If Christianity must not be promoted by the action of intolerance, this is well. But it must not be polluted for lack of self-preservation. This latter is here the primary law of men's being, applied to the primary requirements of God's honour. And if it be thought superfluous to raise an alarm about that which is only in its beginning, and only likely to promote devotion by allying it with art, let some expressions of opinion by competent authorities be cited, to demonstrate the systematic movement for some years past set agoing to undermine the national reformed faith of England by the slow, sure process of vitiating the minds and hearts, the eyes and ears, of the English people. "Let us remain quiet for some years (said one in 1843), till by God's blessing the ears of Englishmen become accustomed to hear the name of Rome pronounced with reverence. At the end of this term you will soon see the fruits of our patience." Another in exulting tones declared the purpose to be this: "It is good for us to be here in England. It is yours, right reverend fathers, to subjugate and subdue, to bend and to break the will of an Imperial race. England is the head of Protestantism. Weakened in England, it is paralysed elsewhere; conquered in England, it is conquered throughout the world." And one, in our own Church, has honestly proclaimed for himself and two thousand more that "the object nearest to our hearts is the restoration of visible unity with the great Apostolic see of the west." What then? After this, the deluge of developments ensues. To all, therefore, who profess and call themselves Christians, and would walk in the clear lines of the Old and New Testament, that are alike obligatory, it must prove matter of the deepest interest to approach the considerations wrapped up in the question of Jesus, when (v. 48) "He answered and said (to Mary's messenger), Who is my mother, and who are my brethren." If these only are such, and on the score, too, of a mere carnal relation and natural kinship, what must be (so far as we may judge) the result to Christ and to His mission alike? First, such an admission was sure to be seized upon and used, as a sanction and support of that speculative Pantheism which Philo took from the school of Plato, —also of that hypocritical pharisaism which confined to an oligarchy of caste all the delights and profits of a privileged approach to God. This, too, might prove too strong a temptation to "the brethren of Jesus" to embark during those unsettled times in political enterprises, such as had been so glorious to the nation in the Maccabean period. This, too, might have precipitated those "who would make Jesus a King" into courses of action, giving substance to the hollow charges of treason trumped up against Jesus in Pilate's Hall. Nor is this all the evil. For in the second place the admission of this claim must also in all probability have been distorted by those who after the Ascension put forth their wild theories of emanations and processions, of æons and angels, and a long string of intermediate agencies thrust in as engaged between heaven and earth in the work of man's salvation. Then, again, when the Apostles themselves, not being akin to Jesus, contended "who should be the greatest." And when a word addressed to Peter exclusively and personally, has been audaciously constituted the basis of an ecclesiastical dynasty wielding Christ's full authority upon earth—is it unnatural, is it unseemly, to suppose an extreme reticence on the part of the Lord Jesus Christ as to anything that might be construed so widely and loosely as to militate against "all power given unto Him both in heaven and earth," becoming interfered with and overshadowed, whether in the one case through the supremacy of the Pope of Rome, or in the other through the motherhood of the Queen of Heaven? How, then (must we not inquire further), does Jesus solve a point involving so much? In reply to His own far-reaching question, He gives a clear answer, uttered with unmistakable energy and visible emotion. In verse 49 we read: "And He stretched forth His hand towards His disciples and said, Behold my mother and my brethren." And this enables us the better to appreciate St. John's words concerning the origin and the exalted status of all true Christians: "To them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His Name,—which were born not of the flesh (by carnal descent), nor of the will of the flesh (by individual energy or personal merit), nor of the will of man (by kingly intervention, popular favour, or priestly right)—but of God," as regenerating them of His grace in His own good times and appointed ways. And further, lest all this might seem but a passing emotion, to die out in dull indifference, or become superseded by some far-off project or urgent enterprise divine—more is vouchsafed, and if we may reverently say it, logic is superadded to rhetoric—rhetoric, too, animated by the impassioned action of hands stretched out, in order to place the matter upon ground of the nearest, most lasting, and most exalted union with Himself. "For (argues our Lord, with a condescension most admirable) whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, my sister, my mother." So, then, here all obedient Christians are lifted up until "their life is hid with Christ in God." Theirs is the closest and most endearing union with their Saviour—the same in kind, the same in degree, as that of His mother with Himself, and of Himself with her, and that which they both alike most dearly prized. And this embraces also the object of his mission, and touches the honour of His Father, to the exclusion of all other ways of access, or of amicable relations between man and God.

---

* Newman "On Development," p. 407.

* Kalisch, Leviticus, Part I., p. 400.

After this, why add more? If we as Christians have a right of privileged approach to the throne of God, through "the new and living way to obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need"—if we may do this as the sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty (every man, woman, and child of us who "do the will of His Father in heaven," being as welcome for Christ's own and only sake, as if we were "the very brother, the sister, and the mother of Jesus"), what shall be said, what thought of the "voluntary humility" of those who instead seek "access" by side-long approaches and self-appointed mediators; or can elect to satiate their vagrant fancies on such an occasion as private prayer or public worship, with the sensuous luxury of emotions raised by mere artistic suggestion? And if the first and second commandments of God are so well known in our midst, and may not with any decent show of reverence be made void by us; and if, further, men daring to multiply mediators do but essay to manufacture gods by transferring to them the incommunicable attributes of Deity, in order to use their mediation. What shall be said of those who, by verging towards the Marian *cultus*, assume a position from which to slide into polytheism without the excuse of ignorance, and embrace idolatry without the plea of spiritual profit? If they do so, let them have the courage of their convictions, and profess to follow the Scribes and Pharisees, who made void the commandments of God by their traditions, or be disciples of those who openly claim that under development "the Decalogue may be only partially binding on Christians"* in respect of the object and manner of worship.

And if any such are found bent on countenancing or commencing in our midst the Marian *cultus*, then even supposing that such a thing is done only incidentally or remotely, it is for such to know and for all others to weigh well and ponder the fact that the idolatry connected with the maternal principle and the genesis of man, is at once the most ancient (astral idolatry, perhaps, alone excepted), and the most widely extended and seductive, also the one too that had a symbolism the most morally vitiating among all the idolatries that have ever been set up. And who will persist in erecting visible symbols (even when not foul and vile)* of this system for themselves, when they must, according to all precedent, prove a snare and a stumbling block to countless multitudes of the confiding and ignorant sort? Above all, what shall be said of the love of God, of their country and of their church, in those who by setting up in and about English churches or cathedrals statues and statuettes of the star-crowned virgin and her child, put the most insulting taunts into the mouths of profane sceptics and scoffing atheists against the credibility, and the purity, and the divine origin of Christ's religion, and against its modes of worship—taunts to many only too welcome, to more only too fatal? What shall be said of the fierce reaction which this very same tampering with idols—only too easily begun—formed into the tremendous scourge of Mahometan Unitarianism, which desolated the Eastern and crushed the Western Churches, and may presumably be inflicted again in the same or some other even more excruciating form? What shall be said of the effect of this *cultus* upon the modern Jew, so terribly cured of material idolatry by the seventy years' captivity, and of how intensely it must embitter him against the faith of Jesus of Nazareth? For, after all, what are these symbols, however used or purporting to be used among us (most truly may any one of these men say), but precisely the copies, and very excellent copies too, of what are used in the maternity-worship of the Assyrian Ishtar, of Ama, of Devi, and of Krishna (wherever the latter *cultus* came from or however it became either initiated or vitiated in the East). And if the law of the Church seems loose and its administration weak enough among us to allow scope for these exhibitions, the time of the Church may be near at hand, when her friends will need to be strengthened and her enemies silenced, because among the millions of the English enfranchised people, the cry will be freely raised and re-echoed far and near, "Down with her, down with her, down to the ground." With such a prospect in the approaching future, the pursuit of such a course as we have alluded to must seem calculated for nothing else than to exasperate and dishearten the largest number and thereby to further disestablishment and disendowment. A very painful task being now brought to a close, must we not be allowed to plead for our apology in treating of it, the language of two Apostles both alike indicating intense abhorrence of the external exhibitions and justifiable alarm at the internal allurements of idolatry. "Wherefore, my dearly beloved" (exhorts one) "flee from idolatry," and the other warns "Little children, keep yourselves from idols." "And now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding great joy, to the only wise God, our Saviour through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion, and power, before all time, and now, and for evermore. Amen."

---

* Newman on "Development," Article on Idolatry, p. 434.

* See O Brien's Essay on "Round Towers."

◆

IT is understood that the committee of the Church Missionary Society have been unable to accept Bishop Blyth's proposal that they should contribute a sum of £200 for one year to aid in the establishment by Mrs. Meredith of a Woman's Mission-house at Jerusalem. —*Record.*

THE Disestablishment of the Irish Church, which was no doubt disastrous, in some respects, to the cause of religion and the peace and security of the Empire, especially in Ireland, has notwithstanding this developed a wonderful interest in the Church, and stimulated its members to increased activity. *The Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, the only paper devoted exclusively to the interests of the Church of Ireland, was established, as a monthly, in 1856. In 1880, soon after the passing of the Irish Church Act, the requirements of the Church demanded its more frequent publication, and accordingly the proprietors undertook to produce it as a weekly paper. The result has been a success, and they are now enabled to reduce its price to one penny. *The Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette* takes a foremost rank amongst Church papers; its articles and news being largely quoted in almost all parts of the civilised world.

THE Bishop of Worcester (Dr. Philpott) completed his eightieth year on Thursday, and the event was made the occasion of an interesting celebration. The Bishop planted a Jubilee oak, and especial interest attached to this, as the young tree was descended from the famous Mitre oak at Hartlebury. Tradition asserts that St. Augustine's conference with the British Bishops of his time took place on the spot where the Mitre oak stands. The Rev. D. Robertson, Rector of Hartlebury, stated that twenty years ago one of their oldest inhabitants, Mrs. Chellingworth, set an acorn from the old Mitre oak. This grew and produced acorns, and five years ago some of these were sown. The little tree which the Bishop was asked to plant as a memorial of the Queen's Jubilee was one which had been thus grown, and it was grandchild of the old Mitre oak. The Bishop gave an address, in which he narrated how he had rescued the ancient oak from being cut down, and the land was now held on the condition that the tree was not to be touched. The Bishop then planted the young oak, and a second oak, and Mrs. Philpott, the Bishop's wife, planted a memorial yew tree in the burial-ground of St. Mary's Church.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
From Mr. CHARLES WHEELER, Barford, Warwick.
"I have felt so greatly benefited by wearing your **ELECTROPATHIC BELT**, that it affords me pleasure to be able to testify to its **curative power.** The swelling and pain in my legs have quite left me, and I experience a comfortable and warming sensation throughout my body."
GOUT & SCIATICA CURED
Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of the **Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,** should at once stop physicing, and remit 21*s.* for HARNESS ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials POST FREE. **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1887.

THE MIND AS INFLUENCED BY SEX.

WE doubt whether woman is necessarily and essentially inferior mentally to man; we are quite sure that she is mentally dissimilar. The great maternal function alone could not operate without gradually inducing intellectual differences, which are perpetuated by hereditary transmission. Mr. Romanes enumerates the leading features of the distinction as determined by sex, adopting the classification of mental faculties as those of intellect, emotion, and will. The general physique of women is less robust than that of men, and therefore less able to sustain the fatigue of serious or prolonged brain action This inferiority displays itself most conspicuously in the comparative absence of originality, more especially in the higher levels of intellectual work. In her powers of acquisition the woman certainly stands nearer to the man than she does in her powers of creative thought. The difference, however, does not assert itself till the period of puberty—young girls being indeed usually more acquisitive than boys of the same age, as is proved by recent educational experiences both in this country and in America. But as soon as the brain, and with it the organism as a whole, reaches the stage of full development, it becomes apparent that there is a greater power of amassing knowledge on the part of the male. The general fact is that a woman's information is less wide and deep and thorough than that of a man. In no department of creative thought can woman be said to have at all approached man, save in fiction. Yet although women have laboured under no disabilities as regards poetry, music, and painting, and perhaps as regards history, philosophy, and science, there has been a general dearth amongst them of the products of creative genius. With regard to judgment, it must be admitted that the female mind stands considerably below the male. It is more apt to take superficial views of circumstances, and to be guided by less impartiality. As a general rule the judgment of women is inferior to that of men, because it is unduly influenced by the emotions. Although inferior to man in acquisition origination, and judgment, woman has the advantage of him in rapidity of perception, which arises from the greater refinement of her sense-organs. This rapidity of perception leads to rapidity of thought which finds expression on the one hand in what appears as intuitive insight, and on the other hand in that nimbleness of mother-wit which is usually so brilliant an endowment of the feminine intelligence, whether it displays itself in tact, in repartee, or in the general alacrity of a vivacious mind.

As to the emotions in woman as compared with man, we find as a rule that they are less under the control of the will. Whether displayed in the over-mastering form of hysteria, or in the more ordinary form of petty waywardness, ready annoyance, and an unreasonable temper, we recognise them as more of a feminine than a masculine characteristic. The crying of a woman does not indicate the same depth of feeling as that of a man. Coyness and caprice, personal vanity, fondness of display, and delight in the sunshine of admiration, are female peculiarities. There is a greater desire for emotional excitement of all kinds, for society and pageants. The meritorious qualities wherein the female mind stands pre-eminent are affection, sympathy, devotion, self-denial, modesty, long-suffering or patience under pain, disappointment, and adversity; reverence, veneration, religious feeling and general morality—virtues which agree pretty closely with those against which the Apostle says there is no law. With regard to affection and sympathy, it may be noted that women derive pleasure in a much larger measure than men from receiving as well as from bestowing; in both cases affection and sympathy are of more emotional value. Devotion is directed by women pretty equally towards inferiors and superiors—spending and being spent in the tending of children; ministering to the poor, the afflicted, and the weak; clinging to husbands, parents, brothers, often without and even against reason. As regards purity, which Mr. Romanes says is the "natural heritage" of women, certainly the earliest comparative estimate of the sexes regarded women as morally inferior to men, and we are inclined to Miss Simcox's opinion, "that the superior chastity of civilised women is the product of sustained, deliberate pressure, legal, social, and religious, and is in itself, so far as it exists, a proof of the extent to which the human race has power to realise its own ideals." We are disposed to believe that religion is the "natural heritage" of women. Perhaps, however, it is within the limit of Christendom that it is most strongly marked, as may indeed be said of nearly all the other female virtues Until the rise of Christianity the gentler and domestic virtues were not held to be at all comparable in ethical merit with the heroic and the civic. But Christ changed the ideal, and gave the highest place to faith, hope, and charity; to piety, patience, and long-suffering; to forgiveness, self-denial, and even self-abasement—virtues which, as we have shown, belong by nature to the female mind.

The will assuredly exercises less control over the emotions in women than in men. Women are rarely found to have that firm tenacity of purpose and determination to overcome obstacles which are characteristic of a manly man. Women are less able than men to concentrate their attention; their minds are more prone to "wander," and they do not specialise their studies and pursuits to the same degree as men. This comparative weakness of will is further denoted by what is popularly termed indecision of character. The ready firmness of decision which belongs by nature to the truly masculine mind, is rarely seen in the feminine. Whereas indecision of character is often so habitual and pronounced among women as to become painful to themselves, and leaving them in a state when important issues are at stake of not knowing their own minds. The mental differences between men and women may, we think, be briefly summed up by saying that woman shines in intuition, man in judgment; that woman is strongest when impelled by emotion, man when impelled by will; that man is creative, that woman is administrative; that woman is greatest in self-sacrifice, and man in conquest and achievement.

◆

WE print to-day a very able and scriptural sermon by Canon Dwyer on the idolatry and dangers of the Marian *cultus*, which we know to be insidiously and secretly spreading in our Anglican Church. The best way of counteracting such sentimental, sensual, and seductive worship is by a more painstaking and elaborate teaching of the Word of God in our schools, and by clear and systematic exposition of its doctrines in our pulpits. The sermon in question may well serve as a guide and example for such dogmatic preaching.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

SIR,—There is a political paper published which lives by printing articles from opposing organs of public opinion, with the view of enabling its readers to acquaint themselves with both sides by way of contrast. And it appears to me that in last week's publication you have followed the example of your

London contemporary. You print a sermon on "Miracles" by the Bishop of Meath, and one on "The Intermediate State" by the Rev. Mr. Panter. You could hardly have chosen two sermons more directly opposed to one another than these are. The Bishop of Meath's discourse is a carefully prepared and well thought out treatise and carries conviction with it, as indeed everything he writes does, because he deals in a common sense way with facts as in this sermon and ignores fancies. Many of us laymen in this country accept the Bishop's teaching without question, because we know he advances no theory that he has not carefully considered and weighed in the balances of a rare logical brain, and a mind richly furnished and stored with the best and choicest of knowledge. But what a contrast there is between this discourse of the Bishop and that of the Rev. Mr. Panter. The one profound, thoughtful, scholarly; the other superficial, weak, and illogical. What right has this gentleman to say that "the bodies of the dead rest in their graves until the great general resurrection," when we know it is *not* so; on the contrary, after a few years the bodies have passed through corruption into dust, and ultimately may help to stop a "bung-hole," or invigorate a cabbage, or as in some countries give bone and sinew to other bodies who eat them. Nonsensical talk of this kind which ignores plain and simple everyday facts does no good but a great deal of harm. If the gentleman does not understand the doctrine of the resurrection let him leave it alone. If he cannot explain it let him say so, and we can respect him for his candour. But this is not the only blunder he has made in his discourse. He makes Paul say that he was taken up to Heaven where he heard things not to be repeated. Pray where does Paul say this? Nowhere that I can find. He says he "knew a man fourteen years ago" (2 Cor. xii. 2) who was so favoured. But not a hint that it was he. On the contrary, if it had been he, he would have said so. The whole tenor of his writings shows him to have been a bold manly speaker and not a dealer in hyperbole. It is probable he refers to John, but certainly not to himself. But enough of this.

JOHN A. WALKER.

Blackrock, Dublin.

◆

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF A PASSAGE IN THE BENNETT JUDGMENT?

SIR,—At p. 243 of Brooke's "Six Privy Council Judgments," I read these words: "Some of their Lordships have doubted whether the word 'adore,' though it seems to point rather to acts of worship, such as are forbidden by the 28th Article, may not be construed to refer to mental adoration or prayers addressed to Christ present spiritually in the Sacrament, which does not necessarily imply any adoration of the consecrated elements, or of any corporal or natural presence therein."

"Mr. Bennett is entitled to the benefit of any doubt that may exist." Now what is this adoration which the Privy Council holds to be allowable? It is an adoration of "Christ present spiritually in the Sacrament." What does this mean? Does "in the Sacrament" means Christ's omnipresence as Deity in the service? Or does it mean His presence in or with the Wafer? I maintain that it does not mean any presence in the Wafer. A virtue as Bishop Cosin and Bishop Bull call it, is not to be worshipped. The woman, when virtue came out of our Lord, did not adore it, but Him. All that may be lawfully adored is our Lord present spiritually in the service. I maintain that this is all that the decision did or could mean. Present spiritually can mean no more, without becoming a local, corporal, or natural presence, which the decision condemns. I acknowledge that, in a former part of the decision, Sacrament is applied to the elements. But in the words I have given, it cannot so be understood without the difficulty I have referred to.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

◆

A QUESTION ABOUT THE PRESENCE.

SIR,—It might help to settle the question on the above subject, if some of our learned divines would state the difference between being "spiritually" present and being "virtually" present. That they are both a denial of a "local" presence seems very plain. Should then any of your readers give me a definition of a presence more than virtual without being local, it would oblige one who really only asks for information. If there exists no difference between the two, it seems a pity that we should be divided about them.

INQUIRENS.

◆

AT Chichester Cathedral on Monday last the Rev. F. J. Mount, M.A., vicar of Cuckfield, Prebendary of Sutton, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Chichester, was installed as Residentiary Canon and Archdeacon of Chichester, which offices have just been rendered vacant by the death of Archdeacon Walker. The Bishop of Chichester (attended by Sir Robert G. Raper, his registrar), Bishop Tufnell, the Dean of Chichester, and the Very Rev. the Dean of Norwich were present. At the conclusion of the service the bells of the cathedral were rung.

CANON JARRATT, Rector of North Cave, Yorkshire, and his wife, who are both over ninety years of age, are seriously ill, the former having fallen down in a procession at the consecration of a church, and the latter from fright at seeing her husband brought home ill.

A MEETING of the committee of the Leeds General Infirmary appointed by the subscribers to the chaplain's fund was held on the 19th inst. The chaplaincy was unanimously offered to the Rev. F. J. Jayne, Vicar of Leeds, and has been accepted. The stipend will be used by Mr. Jayne for the engagement of another curate, and one or more of his large staff will take special charge of the infirmary work, the vicar himself retaining general supervision and being responsible to the committee.

ON Wednesday the Bishop of Oxford found himself well enough to perform the first public service in which he has been able to take part since his recent severe illness. It was to consecrate an addition to the churchyard at Stoke Poges, which is memorable as the scene of "Gray's Elegy." The result has been to extend the churchyard about thirty yards in the direction of Gray's monument. The new ground has been surrounded by a wall of flints, with a handsome lych-gate, which is the gift of Mr. Algernon Gilliat. It has been designed by Mr. Oldrid Scott. In the course of his address the Bishop spoke of the time when, as a boy at Eton, he first visited that church, and said he was surprised to notice how little it had changed. It was still the country churchyard of the poet.

THE election of Principal Ryle, of Lampeter, to the Hulsean Professorship at Cambridge will doubtless occasion some surprise; it was not anticipated here, partly because it was not known that he was willing to leave the responsible duties on which he so recently entered, and partly because the special qualities which he possesses, and which are believed to mark him out as eminently fitted for professorial work, had hardly obtained recognition outside the comparatively small circle of residents who are actively engaged in work connected with the Theological Tripos. The reason of the appointment does not become at once obvious when the list of candidates is scrutinised. Mr. Ryle is a considerably younger man than any of the other candidates; he did not win such distinction during his University career as many of them obtained, and he has published nothing, while several of them have written substantial and scholarly books. At the same time, those who were acquainted with the remarkable excellence of Mr. Ryle's work during the time when he was Divinity Lecturer at King's and Emmanuel, and who are thus best able to judge of what may be expected from him, are ready to defend the appointment as thoroughly wise, since they fully believe that the trustees have chosen the best man. In 1857 a scheme was proposed under the 30th section of the Act of 1856 for altering the Hulsean Foundations and establishing a professorship of Divinity which was not, so far as appears, to have a specially apologetic character. This scheme was rejected in the Senate on June 4, 1857, by 42 votes to 9. A revised scheme was then laid before the University, by which the obligation of publishing was imposed on the new Professor, and in which the following clause was contained:—"In choosing the subjects of his lectures the Professor shall have a due regard to the directions of Mr. Hulse affecting both the foundations of Christian advocate and lecturer." This was passed by the Senate on December 15, 1857. This draft scheme was then apparently laid before the Commissioners; at any rate, before the regulations were formally promulgated as statutes for the new chair this clause was struck out, but the following words were inserted in the preamble:—"It is expedient with the view of more effectually carrying out the purposes contemplated by the Rev. John Hulse in his foundation to make various changes in the provisions of his will for regulating the same, more especially by converting the office of Christian Advocate into a professorship of theology, modifying the duties of the lecturer, etc." The obligation to publish lectures was also retained. This sufficiently shows that the Commissioners were not merely founding a new divinity professorship to be precisely similar in character to other professorships, but were desirous of retaining such of Mr. Hulse's special provisions as they deemed expedient.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alston, Rev. A. E., Assistant Curate of St. Mark's, Kingsholm Gloucester; Rector of Framingham Earl and Bixley, Norfolk'

Barff, Rev. Alfred, Vicar of St. Giles's, Cripplegate; Prebendary in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Evans, Rev. E. Muirhead, M.A., Vicar of Ilkeston and Surrogate; Acting Chaplain, 1st Volunteer Battalion Sherwood Foresters (Derbyshire Regiment).

Filleul, Rev. S. E. Valpy, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Highcliffe, Hants.

Fitzherbert, Rev. Alleyne, B.A., Vicar of Whorlton, Yorkshire.

Hastings, Rev. F. H., Vicar of Preston-on-Stour.

Herring, Rev. J. E., Vicar of St. Paul's and Rural Dean of Kyneton, Diocese of Melbourne, Victoria; Archdeacon of Beechworth.

Hicks, Rev. E., Curate-in-Charge of the District of Tallarn, near Malpas.

Hirst, Rev. James, Diocesan Secretary of the Church of England Temperance Society; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.

Hussey, Rev. E. W., M A., Rector of Bromsborrow.

Jump, Rev. John E., M.A., Vicar of Sturton-en-le-Steeple, Lincoln.

Kempe, Rev. J. W., Precentor of St. John's, Kennington; English Chaplain at Madeira.

Methven. Rev. David, Curate-in-Charge of Fishlake, near Doncaster.

Mildmay, Rev. Charles Arundel St. John, Public Preacher in the Diocese of Bath and Wells.

Montgomery, Rev. H. H., Vicar of Kennington; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester.

Osborne, Rev. William Alexander, Prebendary of Wells Cathedral.

Phillimore, Rev. Arthur, Vicar of Castle Bromwich; Rector of Enville, Staffordshire.

Phillips, Rev. Stephen, Chaplain to the Borough Workhouse, and Infirmaries, Birmingham; Vicar of Granborough, Bucks.

Pitman, Rev. Arthur Lane, M.A., Vicar of Whitwell, Yorkshire.

Preston, Rev. R. H., Vicar of St. James's, Congleton.

Price, Rev. C., Curate of Alvechurch; Rector of Selly Oak, Worcestershire.

Price, Rev. Thomas, Rector of Selly Oak; Rector of Claverdon, Warwickshire.

Puxley, Rev. Herbert Lavallin, Rector of Catton with Stamford Bridge; Rural Dean of Pocklington.

Raymond-James, Rev. T. N., Curate of Chulmleigh, Devonshire; Rector of Luckington, Wilts.

Shepherd, Rev. A. J. P., Rector of Upton Scudamore, near Warminster; Rector of Sulhampstead Abbotts-with-Sulhampstead Banister, near Reading.

Taylor, Rev. T., Incumbent of the New Church at Lower Ince, Wigan.

Tucker, Rev. John M., M.A., Vicar of Syston, Leicestershire.

Twentyman, Rev. John, M.A., Vice-Master of King's College School, Curate of St. Anne's, Holloway; Vicar of Ingoldsby, near Grantham.

Warlow, Rev. W. M., M.A., Curate of Liverpool; Incumbent of St. Andrew's, Kelso.

Wiseman, Rev. Alexander W., M.A., Curate; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Ashton-on-Ribble.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bigg, Rev. Lionel Oliver, lately Vicar of Crowhurst, at Teignmouth, on the 16th inst., aged 46.

Clarke, Rev. Joseph, M.A,, for twenty-nine years Rector of Little Bytham, at Little Bytham, on the 10th inst., aged 75.

Joyce, Rev. James Wayland, M.A., for forty-four years Rector of Burford (Third Portion), on the 16th inst., aged 75.

Lloyd, Rev. Frederick Assheton, Vicar for twenty-eight years of Bullington-cum-Tufton, at Bullington, Hants, on the 14th inst., aged 71 years.

Meyrick, Rev. Llewellyn, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, on the 17th inst., aged 56.

Samborne, Rev. Richard Line Palmer, M.A., thirty-two years Incumbent of Ashreigney, at 21, Montpelier Road, Brighton, on the 17th inst., aged 59.

Wood, Rev. Arthur Widdowson, for eighteen years Vicar of South Muskham, at South Muskham Vicarage, near Newark, on the 18th inst., aged 62.

Yarranton, Rev. Thomas Cook, M.A., for twenty-eight years Vicar of Wythall, at Wythall Vicarage, on the 14th inst., aged 67.

The Church of England Pulpit.

DAY BY DAY.

BY THE REV. R. C. NUGENT KELLY, M.A.,
CHAPLAIN AT GOTHENBURG.

"Give us day by day our daily bread."—ST. LUKE xi. 3.

HOW wonderfully real a simple word often will make a thing. Absolute simplicity is always grand—generally awful. This Lord's Prayer is surely simplicity itself, yet what is there like it anywhere? Is there not in this word I have just read a revelation of the true character of life—of your life?

We speak of "a lifetime;" of youth, manhood, old age, or whatever other great divisions of time we may make to ourselves. We like to cover any lesser and more definite counting of the hours such as might show ugly stretches and patches of waste in our life by these more general names. We like to reckon our life journey by miles, at the least. We do not care to look at the steps which have measured each mile out for us yard by yard. "Good!" we say; "good! I have passed that stage fairly well. There stands the landmark sure enough; never mind about any little straggling to one side or the other, any foolish slips, any lazy shirking of the steep hills; let us say nothing about such little details: what are they? We have, at any rate, taken a great stride on; and now for the pleasantest side of the path for the next stage!" So we blink the truth.

And then comes to us the simple word of our Christ; His wisdom bids us look closer. "You live," He says, "not by years, but by hours; not in those great stages you so much admire, but 'day by day' is the life measured; by words, by thoughts, by deeds, which, though to you trifling in themselves, are just the footsteps by which your miles of journey are made out." "My son," will our beloved Master then whisper in our ear; "My son, what of thy next step? What of the ground whereon you even now stand? Is it holy ground? or is it that you are even now—now, while we pause to look at the way together—standing with both feet firmly planted in a road which knows not God nor is known by Him?"

Our Lord brings us back to the only time we are masters of; this day—now.

We hear, till doubtless we grow somewhat weary of the vain repetition, that we stand ever between the two great eternities of the Past and the Future; we the sum of all the past, the germ of all the future; creation is to-day what yesterday has made it, it can only be to-morrow that which to-day shall bring forth from itself; there is no loss in God's great universe, nor any waste; so we seem to learn at least as the mysteries unravel. But though for ninety-nine times this thought passes through our minds unheeded, there comes to most of us the hundredth time, when it is not so much that we grasp the thought as that the thought seizes us; we are overwhelmed by the terrible reality of it; the word "eternal" takes some sort of shape in our minds, the world grows wondrous large, life seems filled with vast and endless forces, we see something of our own power—our inevitable power.

We see that we are the centres and authors of a strange force, a terrible, awful, relentless force, and we, poor insignificant triflers that we are, we find to our horror that we have been, are now, and ever shall be wielding a power far beyond our strength, and yet we see by the same light that has revealed it to us, that we are responsible for all the effects of it. My God, what shall we do with this dread fate? How dare we go on? yet we may not stand still, that of all things is denied us, nay, there is not time for thought or plan or prayer. You are even now in the full swing of it all, your life has got to itself on its journey, as the fruition of this unheeded power placed in your hands—a great new force of its own; it carries you with it,—none can resist it—on, and on, and on, ever accumulating fresh force, ever using it for good or for evil. Your journey has brought you unawares to a spot where your eyes have been opened, and the great facts of life have burst upon you. Do I exaggerate? Do I indulge in day dreams? Or am I just barely, indeed scarcely, stating your truth as well as my own experience in saying that such a vision of the strange great thing we call *life*, will come upon us at more or less rare intervals, and show us what we are?

But from ever so wide a view of the range of our life we are brought back to ask—What of to-day? what of to-morrow?

Look back—what have the years past brought you? What they have brought you, I, of course, know not; but this I most certainly do know, that each has brought you more than anything else, the fruit of its own past. Away with the thought that we wait till death for the fruit of our life! The harvest is sown and gathered unceasingly; aye, the same seed, the very seed of your earliest life, is sown and sown again, and resown, till the result is beyond all reckoning. Therefore do I even dare to prophesy to you, in the name of God's great law, that in the years to come—aye, and for all eternity, too—your life will be as your past and your present together shall make it. To-morrow is contained in to-day, as surely as the oak is in the acorn, the man in the new-born babe, the harvest in the bare grain.

How, we ask, then, are we to meet the morrow?

We look out upon the life before us, and with our self-confidence shaken by the revelation of the past which has been forced upon us, we ask, On what principle, by what possible means, can we gain the strength our souls so sorely need? The answer comes from our Lord: "Meet this day—leave the morrow." "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." "Give us this day our daily bread." And from the great Apostle who best carried on the work of Christ comes the same answer in the words, "Behold now is the accepted time: behold now is the day of salvation."

Surely this has an attractive simplicity about it which will win your confidence. Do we not begin to see our way? Sick at heart, or, at any rate, weary with the feebleness of our *past*, and therefore mistrustful as to our *future*, we turn our eyes at last to the *present*, and we find that there is at least help for the moment. There is, we find, One Power which guides aright all the powers put into our hands; that there is One True, One Right who can show us how to walk amid the distracting influences which beset us: One great strong Arm which is even now stretched out to lift us out of the flood which hurries us breathlessly and helplessly along: One great Heart which can give its life-blood to our fevered pulses; the Heart which gives life to all the ages; for "of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things," and "by Him all things consist."

Would you know this mighty One? Come, and you shall know Him! but it is the heart of you, and not the head of you which must learn this truth. The heart and the soul of you must be one with the Father's; you must be one with the very God, one with the Lord's Christ if you would have this key to the secret of life. Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.

Do you turn aside? Do I touch too closely upon a conscious weakness as I say this? Can it be that you dread to know God? Are you afraid of seeing too clearly that you are not your own; but that you have been bought with a price—the sacrifice of Eternal Love! But turn to Him again: look once more; is it a God of Love or not that you see? What do you read of that Father in the face of Jesus Christ? Surely, surely, dear friends, it is Love—the Love which must purify the loved one, it may be, but none the less Love that shines upon you from the God of your life. Lay then your life at His feet—your sins and your soul together—and you are free: your soul is now your own, you are master of yourself because you are Christ's accepted servant, and God's reconciled Son.

And what of that force of which we spoke, the force which *limits* our present and our future? There is but one way, a sure and certain way however, by which a human soul shall be freed from the crushing weight of sin, by which it shall be delivered from that self which is our greatest curse: "If the Son shall make you free, then are ye free indeed." Once more does this bring us back to the present. It is ever NOW in our dealings with God. He who descended once to enter into the depths of human wickedness, He who knows all the horrors of sin as we shall never know them, He is still the Saviour, still the Deliverer watching for the souls of the sons of men. Aye! and the two eternities, the past and the future, are indeed bound up in the one present, when the heart opens to welcome the Prince of Life.

Listen to Him who ever was, who ever shall be, who now is! He breathes hope into your heart as you stand fearful before the unknown future, your eyes darkened by the too well-known past; His voice is heard by those who will hear, saying, "Son, daughter, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee." Peace to the sinladen, peace to the fearful! the peace which is the very strength of God shall you find if you will look up to Him who shows you the depth of eternal love, as He hangs upon the Cross of shame, bearing your sins in His own body on the tree. Come, then, my brother, let us away to the Cross of Christ together, and there part with the way of the world, and go forth with our "conscience purged from dead works to serve the living God." THIS is the day of salvation.

But mark! This is to be the beginning, not the end; this is God's word for to-day. You must listen for His word equally to-morrow. Your soul's life, like your body's life, is from day to day; the one must find the *daily* grace as the other the *daily* bread. Our mistake always is that we are never content with the day's portion of either. This is what our Lord, the Physician of our souls, seeks to impress upon us always, for this is the life of faith.

Your way is dark, perhaps, friend; God has, it may be, checked you in your life; taken from you the desire of your eyes; it may be that you carry ever with you—in bodily suffering, or in the secret sorrow of your inmost heart, in some way—the painful evidence of the thwarting of your hopes in life, a solemn warning against any self-delusion, any foolish attempt at the building up of eternal mansions for yourself here. Then what shall we say? what better, healthier, happier, freer, nobler view of life than that of the child-like soul which can at all times fall low upon his knees before the Father in Heaven and say, "Give us *day by day* our daily bread?" Thank God for the love which has brought you to "to-day;" thank God for the truth which has shown you how to escape from the torrent of evil which oppressed you, how to wield the force of that influence which has been entrusted to you; thank God that He has revealed in Christ His Son the present salvation, the present forgiveness, the present peace and word of mercy, the present sacrifice of redemption, the present freedom of your soul; and then step boldly and firmly forth, strong in the Lord of Hosts and in the power of His might; strong to live the daily life, sure of the daily bread, brave for the daily trials, armed for the daily fight, because, having seen God and life, and sin, and your own heart, you have laid yourself—body, soul, and spirit—at the feet of Jesus your Christ, and henceforth are free to seek not your own but God's.

◆

A SERMON FOR ADVENT.

BY THE REV. H. HEBER EVANS, B.A.,
LATE VICAR OF MAPPERLEY.

PREACHED IN HOLY TRINITY PARISH CHURCH, MAPPERLEY, DERBY.

"Now it is high time to awake out of sleep. . . . The night is far spent, the day is at hand."—ROM. xiii. 11, 12.

WE Christians observe the season of Advent every year to remind ourselves of the First Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ to be our Saviour. From now till Christmas, when we keep our Saviour's birth-day, we shall direct our thoughts to that First Coming of the Son of God, when he took on Him our nature, and was born into our world of sin and death, to save us from our sins. But that is not the whole meaning of Advent. Advent also reminds us of the Second Coming of Christ, we know not when, to be our Judge. It reminds us of our Lord's own warning words, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not when the time is,"

"Awake! again the gospel trump is blown,
From year to year it swells with louder tone,
From year to year the signs of wrath
Are gathering round the Judge's path;
Strange words fulfilled and mighty works achieved,
And Truth in all the world both hated and believed."

"Now it is high time to awake out of sleep." Every sinner is asleep in his sins—easy, comfortable, careless, undisturbed, with no thought of danger—and yet none can tell how soon it may be that the great Judge of quick and dead will come to call us all, or that death will take any one of us, to our last and great account. Now it is high time for every sinner to awake out of sleep; and if, by God's mercy, we are ourselves awake, let us try to rouse our fellow-sinners from their fatal slumber of sin.

There are many signs which seem to indicate the speedy coming of our Judge. There is no time to dwell on these. I will just point out two or three, and then pass on,

Our Lord once said: "The Gospel must first be preached among all nations, and then shall the end come" (Matt. xxiv. 14: Mark xiii. 10). No doubt there are distant tribes of men who have not yet heard the Gospel; but speaking broadly and generally, the Gospel *has* been preached among all nations; and events move quickly in this age, so that what has not yet been done may be accomplished much sooner than we expect.

Secondly, there is the wonderful progress made in scientific discovery—man's mastery over Nature. Man's mission, as you may find it plainly stated on the very first page of the Bible, was "to subdue the earth" (Gen. i. 28), and he *has* subdued it. By making steam and electricity his servants he has done wonders. He can now travel more than a mile a minute. Is there any future discovery, do you think, that will enable him to do more than that? He can speak by the telegraph in a few hours across the world. His words now fly almost as fast as his thoughts flow. Is there anything further left to be invented here? He has divided the two great continents of Asia and Africa, making a highway for his merchant ships along the Suez Canal. And even through the lofty and massive Alps, crowned with eternal snow, he has tunnelled an iron road for his locomotive and his trains.

And now, by the latest invention, the Telephone, two great towns in the north are connected by the electric wire, so that the very actual tones of the voice uttered at Liverpool can be distinctly heard at Manchester, thirty miles distant.

I mention these as instances to show that in such matters mankind have served their apprenticeship—they have attained their full age and powers—and, as we can imagine nothing more perfect to surpass these inventions, we can only conclude that we are nearing the goal, that we have almost reached the limit that God has assigned to us. God has been training and educating mankind for hundreds, and indeed thousands of years, and now, at last, the time of training, education, and preparation seems nearly over. Certainly, in this last quarter of the Nineteenth Century, it is high time to awake out of sleep.

There is one other striking sign of the near approach of the end of this dispensation, and that is, the iniquity which abounds.

Wicked as this world has ever been, it can scarcely be that there was ever such general, open, organised, God-defying wickedness as there is in our own day. You have only to glance through the newspapers to find ample proof of this. The harvest of the earth must be very nearly ripe. It is time for the sickle to be thrust in, and for the earth to be reaped. There never was a time when the battle between Right and Wrong, Light and Darkness, Christ and Sin, was waged more fiercely or more desperately. There is now to be perceived just what our Lord mentioned as one of the signs of the end of the world: "Upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth. When ye see these things come to pass, know that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand' (Luke xxi. 25, 26, 31). On which side are you fighting, my friends? Not, surely, against Christ, the Blessed Prince of Peace. But are you fighting for Him? He once said, "He that is not with me is against me." Are not some of you standing by, looking coldly on, without moving hand or foot to conquer sin and to win the world for Christ? The Cross of Christ is stamped upon your forehead, and you promised once, long ago perhaps, to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto your life's end. Are you fighting for the Saviour against all that is wrong?

Then there is a wide-spread, deliberate rejection of Christ; not a mere neglect of the Gospel, but a deliberate refusal of multitudes, and many of them educated, intelligent men, to have Christ as their Saviour. "Not this man," they say, "but Reason, Science, our own will and way—anything but Christ." "We will not have this man to reign over us." "We are they that ought to speak; who is Lord over us?" How long did the Jews survive, as a nation, their rejection of Christ, when they said, "Not this man, but Barabbas" (John xviii. 40)? Only forty years. When the world deliberately, of its own choice, rejects our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and King whom God has sent to us, dying sinners, to give us salvation and life; do you think the world, as it is now constituted, can long survive? It can hardly be.

"What lackest thou, World? For God made thee of old?
Why, thy faith has gone out, and thy love grown cold:
Thou art not happy, as thou mightest be,
For the love of the Saviour is little to thee.

"Poor World! If thou cravest a better day,
Remember that Christ must have His own way.
I mourn thou art not as thou mightest be;
But the love of Christ would do all for thee."

Still we are told that "it is not for us to know the times and seasons which the Father has put in his own power" (Acts i. 7). I only point out to you these striking signs and symptoms that Christ's coming to judge us may be much nearer than many of us suppose. If we meditate on these things we can scarcely fail to be convinced that "now it is high time to awake out of sleep."

"The night is far spent, the day is at hand." These words of St. Paul remind us of St. John's saying: "The darkness is passing away, and the true light now shineth" (1 John ii. 8). What light is that, do you ask? "That was the true Light which lighteth every man who cometh into the world" (John i. 9). "It is Christ, the Light of the World—the Sun of Righteousness" (John viii. 12: Malachi iv. 2). Just what the glorious sun is in giving light, and warmth, and life to this natural world of ours, that same is Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, to the world of sinful, dying men.

The night of sin, of sorrow, suffering and death, is, thank God, far spent; it is nearly over now, never to come back. The darkness of ignorance, and sin, and shame, and misery, is passing away.

The Day is at hand; the great Day of the Lord is at hand—that glorious time promised to a thousand generations, looked forward to so eagerly by all God's faithful saints, when the invisible God will show Himself in all His majesty, love, and holiness to His redeemed creatures (Rev. xxii. 3, 4).

The Day is at hand when God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither shall there be any more pain, but sorrow and sighing shall flee away (Rev. xxi. 4; Isaiah xxxv. 10).

The Day is at hand when God shall, with His almighty power, put down all sin, and redress all wrongs; when He will make up His jewels (Mal. iii. 17), gather to Himself all His poor, meek, humble, afflicted children, who have loved, and served, and trusted Him here on earth, although they have been despised, down-trodden, and persecuted by a cold, and selfish, and wicked world.

The Day is at hand for all God's great family on earth to be gathered to their Father's bright home of love in heaven.

The Day is at hand for God's eternal purpose in Christ to be accomplished, and for time to be no more.

The Day is at hand when Christ will come again to receive all His true disciples to Himself, that where He is there may also His servants be (John xii. 26). Only let us see that we are real Christians, that we do belong to Christ, not in name only, but in deed and in truth.

It is said that the night is darkest just before the dawn; and so, though we are surrounded on all sides by the thick darkness of sin, let us not despair. That very darkness is itself a sign that the day is at hand. It may not be long to wait now for the promised full and perfect redemption of Christ (Luke xxi. 28).

As children of the Day, let us cast off the works of darkness, all sin and wickedness, leaving them at the foot of Christ's Cross, and by the help of His Holy Spirit, let us have done with them for ever. Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in feasting, self-indulgence, and intemperance; but denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, let us live godly, righteous, and sober lives, to the glory of God's Holy Name.

Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in immorality, impurity, and licentiousness; but let us keep our bodies under, and bring them into subjection, and not forget that they are, or ought to be, the temples of the Holy Ghost.

Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in anger and quarrelling, but in gentleness, kindness, and love; remembering that love worketh no ill to his neighbour; and let us strive to "do good unto all men, and specially unto them who are of the household of faith" (Gal. vi. 10).

"But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ." That should be the aim of every one of us. Unless we be born again, and become new creatures in Christ (2 Cor. v. 17), having put on Christ, we cannot look, without fear and trembling, to that Day of the Lord, which is at hand. "Who may abide the day of His coming?" (Mal. iii. 2.) But if we put on the Lord Jesus Christ, if we take shelter and refuge in Christ, the sinners' Friend (Matt. xi. 19); if we truly belong to Him, and are proving this by living Christian lives; if we are growing like Him; if, by a living faith, we are abiding in Him, bringing forth the fruit of good works, to the praise of His name;. if we are living on Him as the Bread of Life (John vi. 57); if we are looking for Him as our blessed hope (Titus ii. 13); then, as He appeared at His First Advent to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, so to us who look for Him shall He appear, at His Second Advent, without sin unto salvation. (Heb. ix. 26-28).

◆

THE announcement of an appointment to the living of Selly Oak was unauthorised. The living is not yet vacant.

ON Wednesday, the 23rd ult., Dr. Hoffman, from the Home Office, visited Great Harwood for the purpose of inspecting the site for the proposed rival cemetery to the one provided by the Local Board. The vicar of the parish, because the cemetery provided by the Board was not consecrated, refused to inter in it, and refused to allow other clergymen to do so. He proffered to give a piece of glebe land for a Church cemetery, and at a public meeting his offer was accepted, and a committee appointed to carry out the scheme. The inspector declined to enter into the question of former differences, and said the only point he had to decide was whether the site was suitable on sanitary grounds for the purposes of a cemetery. So far as he could see it was, and he should pass it. The result is that if the churchpeople can find enough money they will have a cemetery of their own.

THE following memorial against the admission of women to degrees is being circulated among the resident members of the Senate of the University of Cambridge:—We, the undersigned resident members of the Senate of the University of Cambridge desire to express our opinion—1. That to tie permanently the higher education of women to the higher education of men by granting membership and degrees of the University of Cambridge to women would be detrimental to the interests of the education of women. 2. That if degrees are granted to women in connection with the examinations of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, they should be conferred by some independent authority, in a position to consider the various educational problems which would arise from the point of view of women's education especially. Among those who have already signed are Dr. Atkinson, Master of Clare; Professors Stokes, Cayley, Creighton, Darwin, Hort, Marshall, Skeat, Westcott.

MR. F. H. JEUNE, of the South-Eastern Circuit, has been appointed Commissary of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, in succession to Mr. Justice Charles. The learned gentleman is Chancellor of the Dioceses of Durham, St. Albans, Gloucester and Bristol, St. David's, St. Asaph, and Bangor, and is also official of the archdeaconries of Surrey and Essex.

RHEUMATISM, GOUT,
SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, INDIGESTION, CONSTIPATION, LIVER & KIDNEY COMPLAINTS, NERVOUS DISORDERS, LADIES' AILMENTS, ETC. Promptly Relieved and CURED BY
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT
ALL sufferers should read "Harness' Guide to Health," free by post, containing copies of **Thousands of Testimonials.** Every man and woman in search of **Health, Strength,** and **Energy,** should at once send a **21s.** postal order to the **Medical Battery Co. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W. and procure one of these famous Belts, and they may rely upon being
CURED
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1887.

LAW AND ORDER.

THE term "law and order" is so freely used by every speaker at every political meeting, irrespective of the party which the particular meeting is called to support, that it behoves the electors of the United Kingdom to reflect and think for themselves what is "law and order," and how it bears on the great political question of the day. What is involved in the term "law"? By law is meant the code of commands, directions, or rules issued by the supreme power in the State for the regulation of the conduct of its subjects. Let us apply this definition to the case of the United Kingdom. The supreme power is the Queen with the advice of Parliament, which, in the case of the House of Commons, is elected by and therefore represents the opinions of the electors. The franchise has been extended so as to give the parliamentary vote to nearly six million males. According to the census in 1881, there were seven and a-half million families, and seventeen million males, including children—hence, nearly every family, or at any rate, one-third of the male population of the United Kingdom, including children, are possessed of the parliamentary vote, and, by principle of representation, advise the Queen as to what should be declared to be law. Therefore, law in this country is the code of commands, directions, or rules issued by the Queen, formulated by the advice, and after due deliberation of Parliament as representing the people. Order results from the acquiescence of the subjects in the commands issued by the supreme power. From law and order flows the possession of the rights of life, property, and liberty, and in maintaining law and order we are concerned in upholding those rights, the possessing of which distinguishes civilised from uncivilised countries. The supreme power, then, makes the laws; it is for the same power to see that its subjects obey. Disobedience to law is not only an interference with the rights conferred, but the subversion of order—a repudiation and denial of the authority of the sovereign power. It therefore becomes the duty of the supreme power to restore its authority by compelling the disobedient subject to obey. In this country the duties and obligations of this supreme power are vested in the advisers of the Queen—viz., Parliament—from which a small executive body is formed, and is called the Executive, or the Government. The maintenance of law and order therefore becomes one of the duties of the Government. Moreover, in the United Kingdom the law flows from one source. As Lord Randolph Churchill well said at Newcastle:—"It is the same law in Ireland as the law under which you and I live and move and have our being. It is a law which enforces contract and enforces the fulfilment of legal obligations and it protects every man in the daily avocations of life, and allows every man to go and come, and to say and do what he likes and what he may consider to be most for his own interest, provided that by such going or coming or doing the liberty and happiness of his neighbours are not interfered with. There is no other law in Ireland but that law, and it is the same law in England." The Government of Ireland is composed of some half dozen of highly honourable gentlemen—quite as respectable and honourable as Mr. Gladstone himself—who are Ministers of the Crown and are responsible to the Government. It does not differ from former Governments, and any attempts to make out that the present Government is acting differently, as to the enforcement of the law, from the way in which former Governments have acted, and that it is a cruel and harsh Government, are baseless and unfounded and false. The Government will have been untrue to its mission, and also to its duties unless anarchy, crime, and lawlessness—no matter in what shape or form they may present themselves—are suppressed and trodden under foot. The Government in Ireland, therefore, are engaged in a conflict in which the life, property and liberty of Her Majesty's Irish subjects are involved; and in their endeavour to suppress the state of organised rebellion which exists in several parts of Ireland, they may confidently claim the support and sympathy of the electorate of this kingdom. And cannot the same be said with regard to the recent deplorable riots in London. Here again the Government, vested with express powers by Act of Parliament, have intervened to protect the liberty and property of law-abiding citizens against the incursion of organised mobs, gathered together with the ostensible purpose of protesting against the execution of a legal sentence, confirmed on appeal, in Ireland, but actually accompanied by the supporters of anarchy and socialism, who only a few months before had ravaged and plundered the west end of London. Existence would be intolerable if such scenes were permitted at intervals to recur with ever-increasing audacity and violence. Confidence would be destroyed, credit would be paralysed, capital would take to flight, and honest labour would be annihilated, unless the authority of the people, exhibited through its elected representatives, were asserted to prevent such outrages on the common rights and privileges of all.

THE CONTINUITY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH DURING THE MEDIEVAL AND REFORMATION PERIODS.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A, D.D.,
MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM.

A PAPER READ AT THE DURHAM DIOCESAN CONFERENCE, ON OCTOBER 20TH, 1887.

THIS subject might fairly be considered to embrace 900 years—from the eighth to the seventeenth centuries. I propose to give the narrowest limits possible to the terms "medieval" and "Reformation," and to make the one period begin with the tenth century and the other end with the sixteenth. From Edgar to Elizabeth—from Dunstan to Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift—those are the limits of this paper.

It is the *continuity* of the English Church during this long period that has to be examined. And the examination will give us reasons for believing that during these 600 or 700 years there has been no break in the life of the national Church; no moment at which it began to exist or ceased to exist; no point at which the Church of England ceased to be the national Church and was succeeded by some other ecclesiastical corporation; or at which some other ecclesiastical corporation ceased to be the national Church and was succeeded by the Church of England. We shall find it impossible to show that by any steady process of decay one Church perished piecemeal, and gradually made way for another totally different Church; or that by any series of changes, brought about by fortune, or consent, or fraud, or violence, one ecclesiastical body was ousted from its position as the national Church, and was superseded by some other ecclesiastical body quite distinct from it. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence to show that nothing of the kind ever took place.

Even among well-educated persons there are hazy and ill defined ideas on this question: and when one's ideas are not clear one is very liable to fall a victim to delusions and fallacies. We have done much for the solution of a problem when we have stated it accurately and have put before ourselves and others precisely the question to be discussed. The few minutes bestowed in listening to this paper will not have been thrown away, if it helps anyone to have a clearer conception of what is meant by "the *continuity* of the Church of England," of the facts on which it depends, and of the facts (if there be such) which have been fatal to that continuity at one or more points in the six or seven centuries under consideration.

Let us take the case of a society or company rather loosely formed for the promotion of certain objects; then gradually consolidated and organised; and finally acquiring a legal status and becoming possessed of property. Such a society is then established by law. It has certain duties and certain rights. So long as it performs its duties by promoting the objects for which it was founded, so long the law will protect it in its right to the property which it has acquired for the furtherance of those objects; and if it neglects its duties, anyone who is interested in the matter can appeal to the law to interfere and see that property which is in trust for one purpose is not diverted to another. From small and rather indefinite beginnings such a society has grown to be a definite, and possibly a very important fact, in the locality in which it works.

A corporation of this kind may come to an end in more ways than one. It may die of exhaustion, either because its resources come to an end, or because its members retire or die, and no new members take their places. Again, it may wind up its affairs, and either bring the whole project to an end, or transfer its rights and duties to some other corporation which is willing to undertake them. Or, lastly, it may be summarily extinguished by the State, which may confiscate its property or divert it to other purposes. But it is evident that, in the case of any large and well-known society, none of these processes of dissolution could take place secretly, or without leaving evidence of what had taken place. Even a very gradual process of death by exhaustion would in time become known and attract the attention of those who were interested in the society or had any curiosity about its proceedings.

Now the English Church is a society of this character; and during the whole of the period before us it was a large, a well-known, and a very influential society. From small and indefinite beginnings it gradually became consolidated and organised; it acquired a position in the country which was recognised by the law of the land; and the officials and corporations who performed its work were enabled to hold property, as officials of the Church, and to acquire other rights and privileges. In this sense, like other lawful associations, it became "by law established." At the beginning of the tenth century it was so firmly rooted and well organised, that it recovered with rapidity from the desolation from which it suffered during the ravages of the Danes. Each of the old kingdoms of the heptarchy had been made a diocese, which, in some cases, had been divided into two; and each township, or group of townships, had been made a parish. Monasteries also in great abundance had been founded. And each of these three instruments of Church work—the bishop, the parish priest, and the monastery—was gradually becoming endowed with lands and other sources of revenue. At this period it is impossible to dispute what body is in possession as the Church of the people. There *is* only one; and it is through it that the nation is beginning to feel that it is a nation, with common beliefs, common worship, and common pastors and rulers.

The question, therefore, which lies before us is this. Has this religious body, which by the tenth century had already, by a natural and gradual process, become firmly established as the Church of the land, ever ceased to be such? Has it ever died out, or been violently extinguished, leaving the ground to be occupied by some other corporation? Has it ever been ousted from its proud position as Church of the English nation, leaving its rights and responsibilities to be taken up by some other religious society? Can we, between the ninth and the seventeenth centuries, point to any slow process or sudden catastrophe, by which the inheritance, gradually acquired and handed down from bishop to bishop, and from parish-priest to parish-priest, was taken away and transferred to the officers and ministers of quite a different communion?

We may safely answer all these questions in the negative. And we may confidently challenge anyone to point out the time at which the National Church, as originally organised and established, either perished or was turned out, or had its patrimony and privileges taken from it and conferred upon another.

It would be difficult, I suspect, to point to a historical question of equal magnitude which admits of more complete demonstration than this. But the demonstration takes time, and requires patient reading and thought. And consequently many people are content to have confused and inexact ideas on the subject, and thereby fall easy victims to the fallacious arguments of ill-informed partizans or of unscrupulous controversialists.

Among many erroneous ideas which are current respecting the history of the Church of England in the period before us, two have direct reference to the question of its continuity, and must be noticed here. The first is necessarily held in conjunction with the second; but the second is often held without the first.

(A.) There is in some people's minds a hazy kind of notion that, although the Church which was planted by Augustine, organised by Theodore, and revived by Alfred and Dunstan, was an independent Church, in *communion* with the great See of Rome, to which it owed so much, but by no means in *subjection* to it; yet, by some process, not very easy to trace, it gradually ceased to be English and became Roman; so that what in the tenth century was the Church of the English, and a little later the English Church or the Church of England, became part and parcel of the Church of Rome; in short, instead of being the national Church of England, it became the Church of Rome *in* England.

(B.) A much larger number of people believe that (whether it had been so from the first or not) the Church which had possession of England at the accession of Henry VIII. was the Church of Rome; and that during his reign and that of Elizabeth the Church of Rome was turned out and dispossessed of all its property and privileges, while the Church of England was either recreated and reinstalled, or was for the first time brought into existence, and set up as the rival of the expelled Church of Rome. It need hardly be said that this last is the contention of Roman controversialists. And there is nothing surprising in their maintaining it. But it is both surprising and lamentable that many members of the English Church are willing to falsify history and dishonour their communion by acquiescing in it. And of course this view finds favour with the Liberation Society. If the State in the 16th century took away from the Roman Church all the property which it held in England and handed this over to the English Church, why may it not in the 19th century take away from the English Church all the property which it holds and hand it over to Commissioners to be devoted to national purposes. Even so well-informed a statesman as Mr. John Bright has within the last two or three years made use of this argument.

A. Now is there any truth in the theory that what in the 10th century was the English Church, independent of Rome, came to be, long before the 16th century, part and parcel of the Roman Church, entirely subject to Rome?

No truth whatever. The theory is held in defiance of exceedingly plain facts of history which are absolutely fatal to it. But it is able to quote facts in its favour. The case is analogous to that of an innocent man, who is able to prove his innocence, but who is confronted by circumstantial evidence which seems to incriminate him. The circumstantial evidence which seems to make for the theory in question is mainly this. Throughout the Norman and Plantagenet periods the Popes were constantly making enormous claims upon the English sovereign, the English clergy, and the English people: and these papal claims, sometimes through ignorance, sometimes through negligence, sometimes through selfish and shortsighted policy, were either not opposed, or even (though commonly with much grumbling) admitted. The success of the forged Decretals had been so prodigious that many of the chief canonists and statesmen in Europe, to say nothing of the Popes themselves, did not know how baseless these papal claims were: and in this ignorance English churchmen and politicians shared. Besides which it often saved a great deal of trouble to admit a claim, even while its justice was suspected. How many of us, in hotels and elsewhere, submit to what we know to be an imposition, rather than have the annoyance of a dispute! Lastly, in the numerous struggles between the Crown, and the Lords, and the Commons of England, it sometimes happened that one of the contending parties would be willing to buy the powerful aid of the Papacy by recognising as valid claims which were baseless, and which perhaps were known to be such.

But side by side with these ignorant, or negligent or time-serving concessions to Rome we have facts which are quite fatal to the theory that during this period the English Church gradually declined from its national and independent position and became a mere local branch of the Church of Rome. Papal attempts to reduce it to any such position were always resisted and repelled. Before the Norman Conquest such attempts were not made, and resistance to them was not needed. The English Church enjoyed its independence, while it maintained grateful and respectful relations towards the great See which was not only its parent, but was also the mainstay of civilisation and morality in the West. And after the Conquest, when aggressive attempts became common, there was always resistance in some quarter to keep alive a consciousness of the true relations between England and Rome. If the clergy were willing to surrender their liberties, the sovereign and the people held out. If the sovereign was ready to surrender everything, the clergy and the people held out. The independence of the national Church, with laws and traditions of its own, sometimes quite other than those of the Roman Church, was being constantly asserted, and in spite of certain serious infringements, was maintained. Instances abound; but only one or two can be noticed here.

Few, if any, English sovereigns ever did more to facilitate the Romanizing of the English Church than the Conqueror. By death, vacancies and prosecutions for misconduct he had, in less than five years, obtained the appointment to every bishopric in the kingdom, excepting Rochester and Worcester; and in every case he appointed a foreigner, brought up with continental as distinct from English notions as to the authority of Rome. Secondly, he and the chief of these Norman bishops, Lanfranc, greatly furthered the increase of monasteries; and the monasteries, which obtained great privileges from the Pope, were generally devoted to the interests of Rome. The first of these two measures worked its own cure. Like the Conqueror himself, these foreign prelates soon became more than half English, if not in language, at least in their sympathies. The second measure was counteracted by William's own legislation. He had always contended that in conquering England he was only gaining his own; and that, having gained it, he meant to govern England according to England's laws. And what were England's laws, with respect to the See of Rome? William had to go into that question when Gregory VII. demanded (1) more regular payment of Peter's pence and (2) homage from the king of the English to the Bishop of Rome. We have the very letter which William wrote in reply, and in its way it is perfect. Without cringing, he admits the first claim. Without bluster, he refutes the second. Peter's pence, he finds, were paid by his predecessors. *He* will pay also, and arrears shall be paid in full. As to fealty, he finds that English kings have never owed any to the Bishop of Rome; and he declines to give any. He prays Gregory to remember him in his prayers, and so concludes. When Gregory summoned the English bishops to a synod at Rome the summons was not even answered. To make the situation quite clear William caused it to be enacted, that *without the king's leave* no English ecclesiastic should (1) acknowledge anyone as Pope; (2) publish any papal letter; (3) prosecute any of the king's vassals; (4) leave the realm. And while Gregory was contending on the continent that it was a mortal sin for sovereigns to invest bishops and abbots with the emblem of office, William continued to do this, as previous English kings had done; and the Pope did not venture to interfere.

This is no exceptional conduct of a strong-willed king. The legislation of the Conqueror in reference to the Papacy merely emphasised existing traditions; and in subsequent reigns it was constantly being revived in opposition to frequent evasions.

William Rufus refused to allow Anselm to go to Rome as an appellant, and both barons and bishops declared that it was "a thing unheard of without the king's leave." Henry I. enacted that no papal legate might visit England without Royal licence. The Constitutions of Clarendon, sworn to in 1164 by both barons and bishops, declared that appeals were from archdeacon to bishop, from bishop to archbishop, and in the last resort to the *Crown*: not to the Pope. Magna Charta repeated from the charters of Henry I. and Stephen the great principle, good against both Roman pontiff and English king, and often repeated since "that the English Church be free" (*quod Anglicana ecclesia libera sit*). "The *English* Church," you observe: not the Roman Church or the Church of Rome in England. Even the weak Henry III., who was always using papal influence against English liberties, refused the demands of Honorius III. for patronage in England. Under Edward I. the Parliament of Carlisle (1305) made stringent regulations for checking papal exactions. Under Edward II. a statute "concerning divers liberties granted to the clergy" declared that neither the Pope nor any foreign council had the right to make canons for the English Church. There are many things in Roman Canon Law which never became law in England. On the other hand the Convocations, in which, ever since the time of Edward II., incumbents have shared with bishops in synodical action, are found nowhere else but in the English Church. Under Edward III. the "statute of provisors" (1350) speaks of the "holy Church of England" (*seinte Eglise d' Engleterre*), forbids appeals to Rome, and makes it penal to obtain ecclesiastical appointments from Rome. Under Richard II. the "statute of *praemunire*" (1392), which was not the first of its kind, forbad the purchase of papal bulls and insisted on the principle that the realm of England is independent of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope.

This opposition to Roman encroachment was not confined to princes and parliaments. Robert Grosseteste, the great Bishop of Lincoln under Henry III., refused to admit a papal nominee to a stall at Lincoln, disregarded the Pope's excommunication, and encouraged the English to maintain the nationality of their Church and reject the claims of Rome. And in the same reign the whole of the clergy united with the laity in writing letters of strong protest to Innocent IV. and to his Cardinals respecting the intolerable exactions which the Pope, aided by Henry III., was continually making. The letters are written *ex parte communitatis totius cleriet populi regni Anglicani.*

These are but samples; but they must suffice. And, even without being supplemented, they prove the position. The Church of England in the middle ages, while paying to the Church of Rome a respect that was due, and very often an amount of submission that was not at all due, nevertheless constantly asserted its independence, and that with success. Sometimes the sovereign, sometimes the clergy, sometimes the people took the lead in resisting the ceaseless encroachments of Rome: but in one way or other the national character of the Church was never lost, or lost sight of. The Pope might fill benefices with his nominees. But these nominees either never entered England, and therefore had no influence; or else they came and resided, and became more English than Italian. There was always abundance of purely English clergy to absorb and assimilate the foreign intruders. And of course these foreigners had to submit to the canons of the English Church and the laws of the land. In every diocese and in every parish the continuity of the national Church was maintained.

B. It remains to say something about the second fallacious notion;—that at the Reformation the Church of Rome was ousted from England, and that the property and privileges which it possessed were taken from it by the State and transferred to another religious body, the revived, or the entirely new Church of England. Even among English Churchmen there are many people, who, in a more or less confused way, believe in this transfer from one Church to another.

It simply *never took place at all;* and nothing at all like it ever took place. There are numerous facts which ought to make this clear to everyone.

1. The Church of Rome was not then in possession, and therefore could not be turned out. The episcopal Church of England in the 15th century was no more the Church of Rome than the episcopal Church of America at the present time is the Church of England. This has been shown already: but let anyone who wants further evidence look at the Petition of the Prince of Wales (Henry V.) and the House of Lords to the Crown in 1412 against the Lollards.

2. So enormous a transfer of property from one owner to another could not have taken place without legal instruments. No document transfering benefices or other property from the Church of Rome to the Church of England exists. No trace of any such transfer exists. On the other hand much ecclesiastical property was transferred to laymen; and of these transfers there is abundant evidence. The latter kind of transfer is a fact: the other is a fiction.

3. The bulk of the English clergy remained in unbroken possession of their benefices all through the Reformation period. A certain number resigned rather than accept the changes which were made in ritual and other things; but the large majority retained their sees and parishes. Had there been a transfer, all the bishops and incumbents would have been turned out; and others would have been put in to take their places. What took place here in Durham is a fair sample of what took place throughout the kingdom. Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, retained his see through all the changes; and Hugh Whitehead, the last Prior of the Abbey, became the first Dean, while the senior monks became the first prebendaries.

4. Excepting the monasteries, which were appendages rather than integral parts of the edifice of the English Church, not one ecclesiastical corporation was dissolved. In some cases a corporation of many members was turned into a "corporation sole," as when the collegiate Churches of Auckland, Darlington, Chester-le-Street, Staindrop, and Lanchester were turned into ordinary parish churches with one incumbent. But otherwise every corporate life in the Church remained unbroken, with all things essential to continued existence unchanged. The ordinaries retained their jurisdiction, and administered the same law as before. The bishops still sat in the House of Lords and by the same title as before. The Convocations continued to sit side by side with every parliament, as before.

5. Not only is there no evidence of a break or transfer, but the statutes by which the chief reforms were carried out disclaim all intention of breaking the continuity of the Church. See in particular the Act of 1531 against first-fruits to Rome; that of 1532 for Restraint of Appeals; and that of 1533 against Dispensations and Peter's pence. The *congé d'élire* by which the Chapter of Canterbury elected Parker to succeed Pole asserts the identity of the existing Church with what had gone before.

We assert, then, that the Church of England, since the Reformation, is simply the old Church of England with its face washed, and dried, we may add, with a very rough towel. At the Reformation it was neither established nor re-established, nor reconstructed, but reformed. It was established when its early members made permanent provision for its maintenance, and when the law gave security to that provision. No other Church has ever displaced her; and, if her children do her duty, no other Church ever will.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A SPIRITUAL PRESENCE AND A VIRTUAL.

SIR,—A correspondent has asked to have this difference explained. Will you allow me to contribute what I can? Both sides give up—in words at least—a local presence such as is denied by the Black Rubric, and is contrary to the fourth Article, which says that our Lord's body retains still all that appertains to the perfection of man's nature. Hooker, quoting St. Augustine, says that, if our Lord's body is not bound to one locality, it is not a real body at all, so that the Resurrection did not restore to life the body that died on the Cross.

2. Giving up a local presence, we are confined to what Mr. Maconochie calls a "supra-local" presence. Such a presence, not confined to its seat in the sky, as the sun: its light, heat, attracting power, etc., are the effects of a supra-local presence. But Mr. Maconochie adds "supernatural" to supra-local. In this the effect of our Lord's body differs from that of the sun. The sun's effects naturally flow at all times. The graces from our Lord's body, peculiar to the Eucharist, flow forth only on consecration. So far agreeing with this divine, we now turn to a favourite manual of a contrary tone, called the *Christian Passover*. At page 15 we read:—"It has been argued that, as a man cannot be in two places at once, and that as Christ is man in Heaven, therefore He cannot be there and on the altar on earth at the same time. This is to forget that He is God and man in one person." This, of the book, implies that our Lord's body was ubiquitous *before* His death, which I do not know that even Rome asserts. Afterwards we shall find that the writer makes this ubiquity the consequence of the Resurrection. But let the writer speak for himself. "This is to forget that He is God and man in one person, and, in any case, does not apply to a sacramental presence, which is above nature." We will speak of a sacramental presence presently, and of "being above nature." He goes on: "And the argument loses sight of the change, caused by the Resurrection, whereby our Lord ceased to have a mere natural body tied down to the same limits as ours." What change, I ask, was caused by the Resurrection, if our Lord's body before death had ubiquity "because He was God and man in one person?" "He ceased," it says, "to have a mere natural body." But the Black Rubric says that His body is now a natural body, and the fourth Article says the same. That it is tied by the same limits as our own, as to being in only one place, is asserted in Black Rubric, and implied by "all things pertain to the perfection of man's nature" of the fourth Article. He proceeds: "It acquired a glorified and spiritual body, for St. Paul says, etc." A spiritual body does not mean a body non-natural; for our Lord's body was tested by the hands of the Apostles. Spiritual means only free from death and all infirmities. (See Bishop H. Browne on the subject.) It then goes on to say that our Lord passed through the sealed stone, though Scripture tells us that the angel rolled it away, and through the closed doors of the upper chamber, though Scripture merely says that the doors had been closed for fear of the Jews, which implies nothing at all about their not being opened to admit Him. "Thus," he goes on, "we see that his body has acquired new powers." By the Resurrection, he means. But how, if by virtue of the union of Godhead and manhood, He had these before? "And," he adds, "we cannot argue from our present condition to His." But this is exactly what the Black Rubric and the fourth Article following St. Augustine do.

3. At page 16 of same tract we read "Christ's body and blood are truly present in the Holy Communion, under the forms, &c., as really and truly as He was present in the manger, or on the cross, though not in the same way, but in a spiritual, supernatural way, which no one can explain." Ridley said the same to his judges: "I believe that this presence of the body is true, as much as you do. The question is—how? I say by spirit and grace." If this is what the book means, it is what is called a virtual presence, according to what our Lord says, "Virtue hath gone out of me" (Mark v. 30); and, again, Luke v. 17, vi. 19, and viii. 46, "The power of the Lord was (present) to heal them," &c. If one calls this a virtual presence, another a spiritual, or supra-local, or supernatural presence—what differs? It is all the same under different terms.

4. It is sometimes said that our Lord's body is present after the manner of angels, that is, that as angels may, so his body may be in ninety places at once. But Scripture, on the contrary, says that angels are sent from one place to another. Again, it is said, that it is spiritually present. This is true, if all that is meant is that its influence is sent out to a distance. This is what we call a virtual presence, so the strife becomes a mere matter of words.

5. This book says very truly, what we fully agree with,—"The way the presence is brought about is by the powers of the Holy Ghost acting on the bread and wine, through the means of the consecration by the priest." As Bishop Bull says: "The Spirit of Christ, or a Divine Virtue from Christ, descends upon the elements . . . Therefore they are said to be, and are, the Body," &c., which Waterland endorses.

6. Since writing the above, I have seen in a contemporary Church paper an answer to the same question, "What is the difference?" &c. I will give it in full:—"Spiritually present denotes that the presence is a real objective fact, though not physical in its nature." Of course "physical" here must mean corporal and local. It goes on—"Virtually present means that absence is the real fact." No; it only means that there is no physical, corporal, or local presence. But let us hear it out. "Virtually present means that absence is the real fact; but that it makes no difference, since the same results follow as from an actual presence." Reading this carefully over I can see no difference between the two. Both acknowledge a real objective presence—real, not imaginary—objective, from without. Both deny a physical, gross corporal presence. All the absence that a virtualist asserts is that there is no physical presence. It says, we hold, "the same results, as from actual presence By "actual" I suppose he means "a corporal" presence. The effects of a corporal presence we know not. Our Lord says, "It would profit nothing." Therefore, it wrongs us to say that we hold the same results as from actual corporal presence. We set them much higher. "It is the spirit that quickeneth." Allowing your contemporary all credit for honest speaking in this answer, I am at a loss to understand

how he could formerly say, as he did, that the twenty-eighth Article does not deny transubstantiation, though it says it does; that it was meant only against transaccidentation; that only the species, appearances of bread and wine remain, &c., &c. All this asserts a physical corporal presence. However, I will allow him the credit of a change for the better. It is never too late to mend. So I come to the conclusion that our Virtual presence and his Spiritual presence are the same; and I am glad we are agreed.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—Allow me to apply the illustration in favour with all our old divines of the sun. I will substitute "effectually" for "spiritually," and it will read thus:—"Effectually present denotes that the presence of the sun is a real objective fact, though not physical in its nature. Virtually present means that absence of the sun's body is the real fact—absence, locally, from my room and garden—but that it makes no difference, since the same results follow as would follow from an actual presence." What effects would follow from the sun being locally in my room or garden we cannot say—fatal, perhaps. As to our Lord's Body being in actual contact with ours, He says Himself that it profiteth nothing; so there we must leave it.

◆

THE MARIAN *CULTUS.*

SIR,—Allow me, sir, to congratulate you on the fact that the learned Canon Dwyer has made choice of your pages to issue therein his most valuable warning against this *Cultus.* His sermon is philosophical and soundly reasoned—scriptural and most seasonable for these times. What do we see set up in, or on, our churches? Images of the Virgin and Infant, or of the Queen of Heaven, intending to teach us that she rules her Son with a mother's authority! He has well suggested that it was this image and creature worship that gave the impetus to Mohammedanism at first, and that still strengthens its hands against the Church. As he says, it is the same with the Jews. The late Dr. McCaul, for many years a missionary to the Jews at Warsaw, told me that whenever a Jew became sufficiently intimate, he would take him aside, and say to him: "Tell me the truth, have you not an image to worship at least as large as my nail?" Honour be to the learned Canon for lifting up his voice like a trumpet to warn us against this fast progressing sin. And well has he chosen your pages as a channel! There is no truckling with you; no defending the idolatrous worship of the mass, as prevails with other Church papers in England and Ireland. I hope the learned Canon may have such encouragement as will embolden him to republish his sermon as a tract, for more general edification, to which, no doubt, you, sir, would give your hearty assent.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

◆

Reviews and Notices.

"WORD STUDIES IN THE NEW TESATMENT." By Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, D.D. Vol. I. London: James Nisbet and Co. 1877. Price 16s.

THE first volume of Dr. Vincent's Book deals only with the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles of Peter, James, and Jude; it is a large volume, clearly printed in a good type, containing over 800 pages. It is not exactly a commentary; it is like a commentary in that it is a continuous exposition, verse by verse, of the books of the New Testament; but it is unlike a commentary in that it is not controversial, or geographical, or devotional, but only verbal. It professes, so the author says in the preface, to be written for the English reader, and not for the critical student of the Greek Testament; but as we take anything but optimistic views of the scholarship of the average candidate for Holy Orders, we will venture to tell Dr. Vincent that he has taken too modest an estimate of his book. In fact, the volume will compare very favourably with the best book the late Archbishop Trench ever wrote—his "Synonyms of the New Testament." There are not, of course, the full discussions on the exact shades of meaning in synonymous words, illustrated by reference to Greek and Latin classics, in Dr. Vincent's book, which there are in Archbishop Trench's; on the other hand, there is no intrusive doctrinal element in Dr. Vincent which annoys in the "Synonyms." And sometimes Dr. Vincent gives a great deal of information. His article on *δαιμόνια* (Mark i. 34) extends over nearly three pages, and is full of facts and references. So again in his explanation of *ἐκ δηναρίου* (Matt. xx. 2,) he tells the value clearly and concisely; not contenting himself with the very misleading sevenpence halfpenny, but saying that the "penny" was a soldier's daily pay, and was considered very good pay for a daily labourer; and also gives references!

Often he illustrates from Shakespeare. Thus on Acts ii. 40, he writes:—"Untoward (*σκολιᾶς*) lit. *crooked. Toward* in earlier English meant *docile, apt.* The opposite is *froward* (*fromward*). So Shakespeare:—

'Tis a good hearing when children are *toward,*
But a harsh hearing when women are *froward.*'
TAMING OF THE SHREW, v. 2.

'Spoken like a *toward* prince.'
3 HENRY VI., ii. 2.

Untoward, therefore, means *intractable, perverse.* So Shakespeare:—

'What means this scorn, thou most *untoward* knave.'
KING JOHN, i. 1.

'If she be froward,
Then has she taught Hortensis to be *untoward.*'
TAMING OF THE SHREW, iv. 5.

Compare Deut. xxxii. 5."

Very often, also, he distinguishes shades of meaning quite as well as Archbishop Trench does. Thus, on Acts xix. 15, he writes:—"I know—I know (*γινώσκω —ἐπίσταμαι.*) There is a purpose in using two different words to denote the demon's recognition of the Divine Master and of the human agent, though it is not easy to convey the difference in a translation. It is the difference between an instinctive *perception* or *recognition* of a supreme power, and the more intimate *knowledge* of a human agent. A divine mystery would invest Jesus, which the demon would feel, though he could not penetrate it. His knowledge of a *man* would be greater, in his own estimation at least. The difference may be given roughly thus-'Jesus I *recognise,* and Paul *I am acquainted with.*'"

We might refer to many more passages, notes on which are excellent. But we hope our readers will see what kind of work Dr. Vincent has done, and, in our opinion, done exceedingly well. It is much pleasanter to read a book like this than one of our ordinary commentaries, stuffed with endless arguments to prove Mayer wrong, and De Wette still more so, and nobody but the author right. For preparation for an advanced Sunday-school or Bible-class this book would be excellent. There are also Indices of words peculiar to each author; each book has a short and very good introduction; varied readings are also noticed when important, and so are the different translations; Wycliffe, Tyndale, the Revised Version, and even, sometimes, the American suggestions.

We hope Dr. Vincent is at work on the second volume.

◆

"BIBLE MODELS." By Rev. Richard Newton, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 311. Price 3s. 6d.

DR. NEWTON'S Bible Models are such as these:—Abel, the Model Speaker; Enoch, the Model Walker; Samuel, the Model of Early Piety; Elijah, the Model Reformer; Elisha, the Model Helper; etc., etc.; and on these subjects he sermonizes; or at least he says so, and we are bound to believe him, and we do believe him, though at first we scarcely could. But we have concluded from the internal evidence that these sermons were preached in America, and Americans are not as English Philistines are. In America they seem to know nothing of firstly, secondly, thirdly, and then lastly; nor does the preacher call his hearers "my brethren." On the other hand, we should certainly say that the children for whom these sermons are principally intended certainly listened to them; English children, and English adults too, for matter of that, do not always. Instead of firstly, secondly, and thirdly, Dr. Newton tells the children a tale, and applies it. We will extract one—"How Many Mercies in a Year":—

"A little boy, who was very clever at figures, had heard so much about the goodness of God, that he thought he would try and reckon up how many mercies he received in a year. So he took his slate and pencil, and began to set them down. 'Let me see; there are 365 days in a year, and so I must put down 365 mercies. But then, I get more than one mercy a day. Why, every hour brings some mercy. So I must multiply 365 by 24, the number of hours in a day, and this makes 8,760 mercies for the year. But then, God's mercies come oftener than once an hour. Why, every minute brings a mercy. And if I multiply God's hourly mercies by 60, the number of minutes in an hour, it makes my mercies for the year to be more than half a million. How great a number is this! But let me count my greater mercies, said the little fellow. 'There are my dear father and mother, who have been spared to me all these years. Two big marks for this. Then one for health preserved; another for food; another for clothing; and then for teachers, books, pleasant companions, and merry play, more still. And then there's the Bible; a big, broad mark for that. And then the Sabbaths, 52 every year. But, oh dear me! my slate is full, and yet I don't seem to be half through with counting my mercies, so I must give it up.' And this is just what King David himself was obliged to do. I do not know whether he tried to reckon up his mercies as this little boy did, by writing them on a slate. But I do know that when he was thinking about God's mercies to him, he found himself at a loss, and was obliged to say, 'If I should count them, they are more in number than the sand.' And if we try to count God's mercies to us, as David did, we too shall find them more in number than the sand."

We have extracted this tale, because we think a preacher might, with a little change, tell it again. We frankly admit many of Dr. Newton's tales could not be retold. Some of them would make people laugh—American preachers seem to think it part of their duty to be funny. At any rate, even if we cannot advise preachers to take these sermons altogether as models, still they may learn very much from them. They are always bright—always interesting—there is plenty of life in them. And for a lad getting well from sickness the book would be just the thing; he would be interested and taught at the same time.

◆

"SERMONS PREACHED IN WORCESTER CATHEDRAL." By the Rev. Edward V. Hall, M.A., Precentor of Worcester Cathedral, formerly Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. London: James Nisbet and Co., 21, Berners-street. Pp. 95. 1887.

THIS little work, containing nine sermons, preached in Worcester Cathedral, we can strongly recommend to our readers. The subjects are "The Tenderness of God," "Prayer," "The Tree of Life," "Pure Religion," "Rest," "The Soul," "Summer," 'God's over-ruling Providence," "The Love of Christ." These sermons are short, to the point, and practical. We particularly commend those on "Rest," "Summer," "God's over-ruling Providence," and the "Love of Christ." The volume is small, neatly bound, and inexpensive.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Askwith, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Hereford.
Baylee, Rev. S. St. Aidan, M.A., R.N., Chaplain to H.M.S. *Tamar* for particular service.
Berry, Rev. Henry Samuel, B.A., Vicar of Norton Cuckney, Mansfield.
Dart, Rev. John, M.A., D.C.L., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Dickinson, Rev. H. G., formerly Curate at Morpeth; Vicar of Long Houghton, Lesbury.
Firth, Rev. William Wilkinson Dibb, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Fleming, Rev. J. R., M.A., Vicar of Byrners; Rector of Ilderton, Northumberland.
Harrison, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Selston, Nottinghamshire.
Hicks, Rev. E., Curate of Threapwood, Cheshire.
Hill, Rev. R. J., Vicar of Leeming; Vicar of Salton, Yorkshire.
Oldroyd, Rev. John Hirst, B.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Shelmerdine, Rev. Nathaniel, M.A., Curate of Tarsden-cum-Churchill, Oxfordshire; Rector of Great Comberton, Worcestershire.
Stephens, Rev. L. J., M.A., Vicar of Long Houghton, Northumberland; Rector of Whatlington, near Battle, Sussex.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Baldock, Rev. Richard, formerly Vicar of Carlton-le-Moorland-cum-Stapleford, at Carlton Lodge, Lincoln, on the 22nd ult., aged 69.
Beale, Rev. Theodore, Rector of Hopton Castle, at High Tree Bank, Leintwardine, on the 21st ult., aged 67.
Eales, Rev. W. T. H., for thirty-three years Vicar of Yealmpton, at Yealmpton Vicarage, on Advent Sunday, aged 76.
Edwards, Rev. T. H., formerly Vicar of Lindfield, at Lindfield, Sussex, on the 21st ult.
Fletcher, Rev. H. W. Overstreet, M.A., British Chaplain, at Ostende, suddenly, from heart disease, on Advent Sunday, the 27th ult., aged 58.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CENTRAL AFRICA MISSION.

By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., Master of University College, Durham.

Sermon Preached on behalf of the Universities Mission to Central Africa in Durham Cathedral, on Sunday, December 4th, 1887.

> " There shall be the Root of Jesse, and He that ariseth to rule over the Gentiles; on Him shall the Gentiles hope."—Rom. xv. 12.

ALL efforts to fulfil this prophecy of Isaiah, which St. Paul here quotes so confidently, have a supreme interest for Christians. They are efforts to give light to those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death, to overcome the power of the Evil One, and to win souls from blank unbelief or the worship of devils to a loyal and loving allegiance to God and His Christ.

All missions to the heathen have this supreme interest in common. But there are some missions which, beyond this, have a special interest of their own; and the mission whose cause I am to plead to-day assuredly is one of them. As a member of two universities, and as one who has not only heard Bishop Steere preach twice from this pulpit, but has twice had the privilege of entertaining him, I may be prejudiced. But for myself, I confess that there is nothing in the whole history of modern missionary enterprise which so kindles my enthusiasm as the Universities' Mission to Central Africa.

That it is the Universities' Mission is no small thing in itself, and I know not which side gains the most by the connection. On the one hand the Mission has the advantage of being committed to the care of that body of men, in whom are centred continually some of the best hopes of the empire, both as regards Church and State, for the coming generation. On the other hand, these men—most of them young, and with a life of promise before them—have their range of sympathy widened, their sense of responsibility deepened, and their love of romance and adventure turned into a noble field, by frequent opportunities of taking part, either at home or on the spot, in this chivalrous campaign against the superstition, and the ignorance, and the cruelty, and the devilry of what is indeed the Dark Continent.

It may be—although I scarcely think it—that one must be closely connected with university life, in order to feel the force of this influence; but, at any rate, there is one special aspect of the Central African Mission with which every true Englishman must have a warm sympathy—its contest with the slave trade.

I am not going to try to harrow your feelings by a recital of some of the horrible details of that most infamous commerce. But I do ask you to think for one moment of what you have already heard and read on the subject. And then I think that you will not condemn me for using exaggerated language when I say that, if this Mission never won a single convert to Christianity, yet it would still deserve our warm support for services to both religion and civilization by its persistent and unflinching assaults upon this inhuman traffic in the living bodies of stolen human beings. Every noble feeling in our nature goes forth in admiration and gratitude—sometimes it may be almost in envy—towards the men and women who have left the comforts and sweetness of home-life in England to go forth and labour in a trying climate and under a tropical sun upon such a quest as this.

But the Mission does win converts to Christianity, and makes the winning and the training of them its chief care. And it is in this work that another of its marked features—a feature which it has in common with only a few other missions—comes out. In most centres of missionary work the Christian communities which are endeavouring to win over the native population from heathenism to the Gospel have the field to themselves. The only question is how soon they can induce the heathen people around to accept the faith of Christ. But in Central Africa, as in some parts of India, it is far otherwise. Here the Mission works in the face of an energetic, persevering, and very successful competitor. The effort to win over the Africans from their debasing idolatries to Christianity is opposed, not only by the deep-seated attractiveness of the native superstitions, but by the rival efforts of Mahometan missionaries. The work is a race between Islam and the Gospel.

Owing to a paper which was read two months ago at the Church Congress at Wolverhampton, and which has provoked a great deal of controversy, this aspect of missionary work in Central Africa has been brought very much to the front. That paper made certain statements of fact, some of which are unquestionable, while others, even if exaggerated, contain a very large substratum of truth; and from these alleged facts a conclusion was drawn, which, whether right or wrong, is certainly worthy of serious consideration. With that conclusion I have here nothing to do; but the facts, real or supposed, on which it is based, require notice. However unwelcome they may be, we ought to be grateful to those who, by stating them, have given us the opportunity of refuting them if they are fictitious, and reckoning with them if they are not. If there be a sphere in which it is specially disastrous to live in a fool's paradise, crying, "Peace, peace!" where there is no peace, that sphere is mission-work. But with regard to what is now before us, even if the whole of what has been stated is true, there is no reason for us to be either amazed about the past, or panic-stricken for the present, or out of heart respecting the future. It is in your *patience* that ye shall win, not only your own souls, but the souls of others.

The alleged facts are mainly these:—

1. Attempts to proselytize Mahometan nations are notoriously unsuccessful. An African tribe, once converted to Islam, never reverts to paganism, and never embraces Christianity. That I believe to be indisputable.

2. Islam, as a Missionary religion, is more successful than Christianity. Not only are the Moslem converts from Paganism more numerous than the Christian converts, but Christianity in some regions is actually receding before Islam. We not only do not gain ground, but even fail to hold our own. Here, again, although the amount by which the annual number of Moslem converts exceeds the annual number of Christian converts may have been over-estimated, yet there seems to be no good reason for doubting that the balance is very decidedly in favour of Mahometanism; and, if we count the merely nominal converts on both sides, that it is enormously in favour of Mahometanism.

3. Islam, though quite unfitted for the higher races, yet among barbarous tribes has done more for civilization than Christianity has done. On this one remarks that civilization is a word of various meanings; but if it be limited to those externals in which Mahometanism so largely consists, the statement (so far as present results can be ascertained) is very possibly true. Whether Mahometanism, even among the lowest savages, has done more than Christianity towards laying lasting foundations for that civilization which embraces the spirit as well as the body of man, is another question.

What is there to surprise, to perplex, to dishearten us in all this?

The Moslem Missionary preaches so much of the truth, that it is no wonder that his barbarous disciples think that he has taught them the whole of it, and that henceforward the book is closed. As compared with their fetishism, cannibalism, human sacrifices, and witchcraft, the doctrine that there is but one God, who is a God of love and righteousness, who hears prayer, and rewards holiness, and punishes sin, seems so simple, so lofty, and so pure, that they desire to hear nothing more; and it is difficult to persuade them that a belief in the Trinity would not be a return to polytheism.

Viewed in connexion with this stubborn tenacity of Islam, the rapid success of its missionaries is no doubt a serious fact. But so long as we do our duty in labouring to bring over both pagans and Mahometans to the truth, we may be content to leave the issue in the hands of Him whom the Mahometan ignorantly worships. In the animal and vegetable world those species which propagate themselves most rapidly, are neither the most useful nor the most lasting. Why should it be otherwise in the sphere of faith and morals? We are working for Him in whose sight a thousand years are but as yesterday, and we are working not only for time but for eternity. We must be content to work slowly.

Lastly, is not this attempt to measure the comparative merits of the two religions by statistics about *visible* results altogether a mistake? It is God that gives the increase. And if it pleases Him to withhold all signs of increase, our duty to go on planting and watering remains as binding as ever. Be it so, that we make but one convert where the Moslem can count scores, and that our converts when made are but sorry Christians; our obligation to promote the preaching of the Gospel is not lessened one jot. It will be no shame to us to have converted no one, if only we have done what we could. It will be both shame and sin to us, if, because our efforts seem fruitless, we ever cease to try. At the Day of Judgment we shall be asked not, How many souls have you won? but, What have you done to win them? What have you sacrificed in money, in labour, in thought, in prayer, in order to bring Christ's truth home to those, who at present either cannot or will not hear it.

Let your prayers and offerings to-day supply some answer to that question. Continue them in faith, and then leave results to God; remembering that there are results which cannot be tabulated in a missionary report, and which are none the less precious on that account. "In due time we shall reap, if we faint not." "He that has arisen to reign over the Gentiles, in Him shall the Gentiles hope."

◆

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

By the Rev. W. WALTER MERRY, D.D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford.

Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, October 31st, 1887.

"Out of weakness were made strong."—Heb. xi. 34.

It would seem unnatural on this last Sunday of October, the beginning of a week that reckons among its days the festivals of All Saints and All Souls, not to follow out some of the thoughts which are suggested by the very title of these two commemorations. It may not, indeed, be worth while to discuss the origin and the later modifications of these festivals. We may be content to remember that the Eastern Church celebrated the glories of those who had been martyrs for the faith of Christ on the Octave of Pentecost; while in the West, the consecration of the Roman Pantheon to Christian ritual was made the occasion of a feast in honour of the blessed Virgin and All Martyrs, which was kept in the month of May. But as the number of Saints' days was ever growing, through the exercise of the power of canonization assumed by the Popes, there was by-and-by no room left in the Church offices for the many claimants to this high honour. The number was ruthlessly abridged, but the Festival of All Saints was still retained "in commemoration of all the known and unknown Christian worthies, and of the communion of the Church triumphant with the Church yet militant on earth."

This seems to open so wide a field, and to appeal to us in such a universal language, that the season ought not to recur without forging anew many a golden link between the present and the past; refreshing and elevating our memories of the departed, and making us realise what we mean —and what we do not mean—by saintship.

If the ordering of the course of this world were left, for a little space, in your hands, what ideal picture would you sketch for yourselves of the saint's progress, the beginning and the advance of the religious life? I am sure you would surround it with light and joyfulness; you would arrange its successive stages as steps in a happy and unchecked movement; you would make the whole action of its powers work together for the hastening of the final triumph. The very outset of that life, as you would wish to depict it, should have the saintliness of innocence. It should begin with a true regeneration, a new birth unto righteousness. The youngest neophytes therein should be "Babes in grace;" and the little children should be there, to whom the Apostle writes so lovingly, because they "have known the Father." Those little children should grow up into the young men, of whom the same Apostle says, that they "are strong and have overcome the wicked one." The young men, in due course, should be those wise and sober fathers who have "known Him that is from the beginning." Thus, the whole process should be marked by growth, by development, by foretastes of perfection. Then, perhaps, by way of colouring your ideal somewhat with the tints of reality, so as to bring it down to a human tone, you would insist on saying: "Only grant us this certainty of advance; and we ask not for indemnity from troubles. We do not seek to have the world changed for us; we accept it as a place of probation. Yea; grant us only this assurance, and though we go through the Vale of Misery, we will use it as a well; the wilderness shall rejoice for us and blossom as the rose. We shall see before us the pillar of the cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night; and we shall be satisfied that we are under heavenly guidance. We shall have angels' food for the refreshing of our souls. We shall go from strength to strength, till each one of us appears before the God of Gods in Zion."

It was said of a splendid effort of English heroism—"It is magnificent, but it is not war." So we might say of your picture—"It is beautiful, but it is not life." Such an advance, as you imagine, could not represent our daily struggle. It would be a saintly procession, such as the painter's hand may draw along the walls of some fair church; where young men and maidens, old men and children, with out-stretched hands and heavenward faces, move, or seem to move, solemnly onwards, with the dawn of glory already in their eyes. Such was not the path that God set out for His saints. Such was not the life vouchsafed to those, "who, through faith and patience, now inherit the promises." "He walked with God, and was not; for God took him," are words that describe an entirely exceptional blessedness. Enoch's translation, without note of failure or struggle, is solitary in the Bible.

Yet, doubtless, as soon as our thoughts begin to gather round those who have passed away from the world—those servants of God who have departed this life in His faith and fear—we are apt to give play to our fancy. We half-unconsciously canonise the great and good, who have left memories behind them, and we suffer ourselves to imagine theirs as a shining path of triumphant saintliness, not open to others; that to them were granted possibilities and inspirations which do not reach to us. We instinctively look upwards and seem to see them mounting the steps of that golden ladder, which Jacob saw sloping from his stony pillow at Bethel, up into the heaven of heavens. We seem to see them ever rise and rise; each step firmer and yet lighter. We track their ascent above the mists and vapours, the clouds and darkness, of this lower world. They breathe each moment in a purer ether, a diviner air; till they pass into the light beyond our gaze, as the evening of a saintly life melts into the dawn of the heavenly day. God forbid that we should cloud so fair a vision; or seek to lessen the power of it, and bid it "die away, and fade into the light of common day!" Indeed, we cannot over-state the marvel of God's grace in bringing His servants safely through this mortal life, into the kingdom prepared for them. We cannot do otherwise than represent their life as a rise to higher levels. There is no fear of exaggerating the glories, that eye hath not seen and ear hath not heard, prepared by God for them that love Him.

But we shall do wrong to the memory of departed saints—we shall do harm to our own hopes and aspirations—if we accustom ourselves to look upon the course of such men and women with something of hopeless admiration, and think that there were miracles wrought for them which are withheld from us, or that some new road to heaven was pointed out to them, which is closed to others. For if we learn to think like this, they will pass out of the sphere of our examples, and the power of their life upon ours will be half extinguished. They will seem to us to stand upon inaccessible heights, to which they have mounted by unattainable aids; whereas, their path is our path, their aids our aids. They mounted the shining stair by the one only way by which it ever has been, or ever will be, mounted. They rose on "stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things." The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, after rehearsing his splendid roll-call of those who had been victorious by the living power of a faith, that was often imperfect or mistaken, addresses his hearers as men who are heirs of this long list of triumphs; while he represents these saints who have entered into their rest, as watching from their place of observance, and noting with eager interest those who are passing through the same conflicts and troubles as their own. "We are encompassed," he says, "with a great cloud of witnesses." The very air about us is full of gazing eyes and listening ears, to see what we are doing, and to hear what we are saying. Those watchers and listeners compare or contrast our life with theirs. Every inch of the ground is known to those experienced witnesses. They remember what it was to them, and how they passed through it. If we could make an appeal to that silent host, and cry to them to reveal the secret of their salvation and success; what do you think they would say? "Tell us," we would cry, "how God helped you? by what aids were ye enabled to rise above the world? what is the meaning of a strength made perfect in weakness, and how was it vouchsafed to you? How was it that the bearing of the cross led to the wearing of the crown? How was it that light was made to shine out of darkness?" Let us listen breathlessly for their answer. It is a wide experience to which the appeal has been made. The saints of many generations are among those witnesses—kings, prophets, patriarchs, apostles and martyrs: unnamed saints, besides, whose greatness was their simplicity, and whose nobility was their self-surrender: servants of Christ of whom the world was not worthy. Among them, friends of our own, whom we have loved and lost, and whose goodness we never realised till they were taken from us. There is not one of all that multitude, but would make this answer to our questioning. "God let us mount on what He gave us grace to subdue." See how this throws us back upon ourselves! Perhaps, when we made our question, we thought to have had the revelation vouchsafed us of some deep mystery: to hear of some new method, some untried helps; to catch some unfamiliar enlightenment; to descry some new path to heaven that avoids the precipices of the Hill of Difficulty, and never comes near to Castle Doubting. There is nothing of all this. Those witnesses will tell you how God's grace was sufficient for them; how the power of the cross of Christ, the teaching of the Holy Spirit, the help of prayer, the might of faith, made it possible for them to overcome the world. "And which of all these means of grace," they will say, "is denied to you? What hinders you from being followers of us?" Do not misunderstand their confession, when they acknowledge that they have risen on what God gave them grace to subdue. Perhaps, indeed, you will say, "Nay! what raised and advanced them was the growth of heavenly graces — humility, meekness, charity, purity, truth, and faith." But these graces are not sudden inspirations; nor are they only traits of natural sweetness or resolution. They are trophies of war, spoils of the foe. The humility that graced these saints was the victory won over pride. The meekness that sobered them was the triumph over self-assertion. The purity that sanctified them was the mastery over their lower nature. The charity that warmed them was the defeat of selfishness. The faith that nerved them was the subjugation of unworthy doubts and false views of God. The truthfulness that ennobled them was the living protest against moral cowardice.

Does this simple confession seem to you to lower saintship to too common a level? Would indeed that it were more common! I am concerned in insisting that it is an attainable level. We have done harm by our misuse of the name of saint. Christian art and Christian legend have impressed indelibly on our minds the idea of a special class of God's servants, to whom alone the name by right belongs, for signal virtues, superhuman gifts, angelical devotion. We encircle their brows with the aureole, and put the palm-branch in their hand. We push the conception of them too far away from our every-day lives. We surround these saints with an atmosphere of transcendental holiness, till what we seem to gain in profound reverence and awestruck admiration we lose in effective sympathy and real fellowship.

Perhaps it is because we have applied the word "saint" to an ideal which is beyond our sphere, that scoffers have delighted to use the title invidiously to mark out the claimants to a superior holiness. It was a wiser method whereby the Apostles again and again addressed their Epistles to the "saints" in the various churches, including therein all those who had embraced the faith of Christ. For it kept up a broad sense of Christian brotherhood, and it emphasised the claim of the Christian profession. They were all "holy to the Lord"; they were all consecrated to His service. This was the meaning of the title. How far were they walking worthy of the vocation wherewith they had been called—called to be saints?

May I venture to say that religion is not like a competitive examination, in which a few marks make all the difference (say) between a first and a second class? Nor is it mere matter of choice whether we shall content ourselves with the minimum requisite for passing, or whether we shall be candidates for distinction. It will never do for us to accept complacently that there must be a certain number of saints (properly so called) who shall represent the Honour-men in the List, while it is sufficient for us to belong to the bulk of the Pass-men, as an ambition quite high enough for us. Forgive this homely illustration. It faithfully represents a very common point of view. It is better to say that, between those who may be called saints and those who may not, there is difference of kind, not of degree; it is not a case of minimum and maximum. In one sense, of course, there must be infinite degrees of spirituality, of enlightenment, of devotion; in another, and a broader sense, there is only one possible distinction—the distinction that is drawn by the principle and motive of each man's life. The germ, as well as the full blossom and fruit of saintliness, is love to God and love to man in God. Herein is our qualification; here is our test for ourselves. Love knows nothing of a minimum of service; it does all that it can. I must not pause to draw out its informing, transfiguring power on the life. I may now speak of it as making our penitence sweet, our obedience delightful; as exalting humility and extinguishing selfishness; as making purity an act of high devotion, as supplying what is lacking in faith's argument. But for us who have been wondering what saintship is, and how, if at all, it could be ours, here is the answer ready; so seemingly simple, so strangely easy, and yet, when we try our lives by it, so searching, so exacting.

Do you desire a place on the roll-call of saints? There is room for you all. The list is one of comprehensiveness, not of exclusiveness. But there is, at any rate, one thing necessary to support your claim, and that is the presence of faith. Some touch of that spirit must animate the work of every life in order to give that work the worthiness, the seriousness, the truthfulness, that alone makes it valuable.

I am not concerned to seek for any epigram wherewith to sum up the characteristics of the days in which we now live.

If I could find a phrase, it would certainly be the expression of more than one sharply-cut antithesis. It might point the strange contradiction between the reckless clamour for unlimited freedom and the strange abandonment of individual action to the mandate of religious or political party. Another phrase might mark the co-existence of a widespread indifference and a genuine enthusiasm for good works—evangelistic, philanthropic, educational.

We thank God for the enthusiasm—whether the cry of East London has kindled a fire in the heart of many a man in the midst of systematic idleness or of pressing occupation; or whether the needs of suffering humanity has touched the sympathy of many a woman—maid or matron—and sent them out to nurse the sick—there is, no doubt, an earnest struggle being waged against many of the powers of evil.

The secret that marks that struggle as a worthy crusade is the old secret of saintship—a stimulating, maintaining faith. It is that which separates the spurious from the true—the worker who makes a short-lived effort for a passing fancy, for a new sensation, for a desire for power, or, perhaps, notoriety—and the worker who, having once pledged devotion to a worthy cause, maintains that devotion through sunshine and shade, through failure and encouragement, through evil report and good report. But what am I to say to those who have enervated themselves by a disbelief in greatness or goodness, by a contempt for self-sacrifice, and a complacent acceptance of a useless life? What am I to say to those whose work may be intense, but whose aim is sordid; whose stimulus is not faith but self-worship? They may win what they are seeking; they may succeed in their scheme; but let them remember that even the failures of those who are touched with the spirit of saintship are better than the victories of a shrewd cleverness, or the triumph of a lucky chance.

Lastly, when I think of One, Whose Divine example it is our glory to follow, Whose character—more or less clearly realised—is at once the ideal and the inspiration of saintship, I feel that we have the perfect comment on our text; the pattern and model of those who "out of weakness were made strong." For the power of Christ Incarnate in humanity lies not in His miracles, not in the possession of a veiled Omnipotence, but in singleness of purpose, in absolute dependence on the Heavenly Father, in perfect devotion to the work which was given Him to do, and complete submission to the trials which He was ordained to suffer. "He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and hath given Him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the father." If the Captain of our Salvation was thus "made perfect through suffering," what more can we ask than that the disciple should be as his Master, and the servant as his Lord?

* * *

At a meeting of the Chapter of Truro, held on St. Andrew's Day, under the presidency of the Bishop, who is also Dean, Canon H. H. Du Boulay was unanimously elected Proctor. Canon Du Boulay was chaplain and secretary to Bishop Phillpotts, of Exeter, from 1864 to 1867, and is now vicar of Newlyn East. He has been editor from 1877 of the *Truro Diocesan Calendar.*

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
From Mrs. LAVANIA FOWLER, 2, New Pond Cottage, Romsey, Hants.
"It affords me great pleasure to state that your **ELECTROPATHIC BELT** has not only removed the pain I have so long suffered, but has been the means of so strengthening my **spine** as to prevent the recurrence of any difficulty I have had in breathing."
SPINAL WEAKNESS.
Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of the **Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,** should at once stop physicing, and remit 21*s.* for HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials POST FREE. **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1887.

POOR LITTLE WALES.

FOR a long time past there have been mutterings of the coming storm with regard to the Church in Wales. Time after time has some member of Parliament attempted to get a Disestablishment Bill introduced into the House of Commons. Editors of newspapers in the Principality have caused statistics of congregations to be published, with the intention of throwing dust into people's eyes, and so give colour to the pretext that the Church is an alien institution, opposed to the wishes and the instincts of the Welsh speaking population. And now the climax is reached. Mr. Gladstone, who a few years ago was so thoroughly opposed to the Disestablishment of the Welsh Church, has now veered round, and states that the Disestablishment of the Scotch and Welsh Churches is ripe for decision. From the faltering, wavering statements made at Swansea a few months ago, we have now the avowed declaration made at Nottingham. But there is one proviso, viz., that they—the Welsh people—are to help him to give Home Rule to Ireland, and then, in return for this gracious act, he is prepared to despoil the Church; and we suppose that, as in the case of Ireland, Maynooth must be endowed, so in Wales we presume that the Calvinistic Methodists, or some such body, will be endowed with the spoils of the old, ancient Church; or that the revenues may be used for the payment of county rates, etc., the same as is proposed to be done in England.

These facts are very galling, but there they stand, and therefore Churchmen must indeed bestir themselves, for it is certain that if the Welsh Church is despoiled, the enemies of the Church will soon be clamorous for the Disestablishment of the English Church. And although it may seem to some extremely puerile to cry "Wolf, wolf," yet we may awake some day to find a manifesto on this subject from the pen of the distinguished denizen of Hawarden, stating that events have moved so quickly, and that the question is ripe for decision. That there *will* be an attack upon the English Church sooner or later, no one who cares to read between the lines can deny, and therefore, remembering that to be forewarned is to be forearmed, we must be prepared for it, just as churchmen must be in Poor Little Wales.

We are extremely glad to notice the carefully-worded memorandum on the subject of the Church in Wales put forth by the Church Defence Institution, to which is appended the names of such distinguished noblemen as Lord Egerton of Tatton, Lords Dartmouth, Devon, and Fortescue, and several others, which we trust, will receive the attentive perusal that it deserves. There is one statement in this memorandum which deserves most careful attention; it is this: "We altogether reject the allegation that the Church in Wales is an alien Church, as historically false, and regard it as the representative of the ancient British Church, and a link connecting us with the early introduction of Christianity into this country." We are afraid that the historical facts have long been lost sight of, and yet it is patent to every student of ecclesiastical history, that the churches of Caerleon on Usk, and St. David's, and St. Asaph figure conspicuously in the early history of Christianity into this land. The see of Llandaff is said to have been formed about the year A.D. 500, Bangor A.D. 516, St. David's A.D. 540, and St. Asaph A D. 560. These facts completely disprove the statement of the Liberation Society as to the Welsh being "an alien Church." If we compare with these figures the date of the foundation of the various sects, we shall clearly see that for historic continuity the Church holds herself up head and shoulders above all the others, for with the exception of the Independents, Baptists, and Calvinistic Methodists, they all date from the present century. The Calvinistic Methodists date their origin from the time of Whitfield, and the Independents and Baptists from the sixteenth or seventeenth century; all, in fact, since the Reformation.

In order to stem the tide which is fast rising, it behoves churchmen, both in the Principality and also in England, to instil into the minds of people truths concerning the history of their Church, to show what she is, what she has done, and also what she is doing for the people of this land; that she is no alien, but that her history dates far back into the distant past. And while many are anxious to see Disestablishment carried in order to partake of the spoils, there are many farmers who, anxious to be free from the heavy burdens that agricultural depression has brought upon them, support the motion because they think that they would then be free from the payment of tithe. It is necessary to show to these that Disestablishment will bring no immediate gain; that if the Church were separated from the State, and her endowments confiscated, that tithe would still have to be paid, either by the landlord or the tenant. The whole thing is based upon a misconception, and the sooner the mists and scales are removed from people's eyes, the better will it be. Disestablishment will not affect the towns so much, but it is dreadful to contemplate what it will be to the country parishes in the Principality.

We can only trust that the counsels of Mr. Gladstone and his followers will not be accepted by the great masses of the people, and that they, realising what it is they are invited to give up, will echo the cry of "No Surrender."

THE LATIN VULGATE AND ITS VERSIONS.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE NEWRY CLERICAL CLUB, BY THE REV. T. B. NAYLOR, B.D., VICAR OF WARRENPOINT, IRELAND.

THE Latin Vulgate has peculiar claims on our attention. The great learning of its compilers, the name of Jerome,—a host in itself—its early reception in the Western Church, its acceptance by the Council of Trent as authentic and inspired, its influence on the early English translations by Purvey and Wickliffe, conspire to make this version one of no ordinary interest. It is hardly wise, as some Protestants do, to regard the Vulgate as the exclusive property of the Church of Rome, and to condemn it off-hand.

"The Vulgate should have a very deep interest for all the Western Churches. For many centuries it was the only Bible generally used, and, directly or indirectly, it is the real parent of all the vernacular versions of Western Europe. The Gothic versions of Ulphilas alone is independent of it."—(Smith, "Bible Dict.," art. *Vulgate.*)

It exercised considerable influence on Luther's version, 1523; and through it on our own Authorized version: "It was the version which alone they knew who handed down to the Reformers the rich stores of mediæval wisdom, the version with which the greatest of the Reformers were most familiar, and from which they had drawn their earliest knowledge of Divine truth."—(Smith, *ibid.*)

Luther, in his "Table Talk," says: "Afterwards the Bible was translated by Hieronymus (who first amended and corrected the seventy interpreters) out of Hebrew into the Latin tongue, which translation we use to this day in the Church. And truly said Luther he did enough for one man. *Nulla enim privata persona tantum efficere potuisset.* But he had not done amiss if he had taken one or two learned men to his translation besides himself, for then the Holy Ghost would more powerfully have been discerned, according to Christ's saying, 'Where two or three be gathered together in My name, there will I be in the midst of them.'"

But it would be equally unwise to concede that the claim put forward for it by Rome as regards authenticity and inspiration rests on sure grounds. As a version, it is most valuable; but it is a version, and nothing more. As a translation, it possesses rare merits, and has been most useful in the spread of truth; but that is no reason why we should exalt it to the position occupied by the original texts, or with the Church of Rome set it above the very fountain from which its streams have been derived.

Doubtless the text suffered in the dark ages through the errors of the copyists, and perhaps, also, from the wilful perversion of those who would gladly shelter growing errors of the Papacy under the illustrious patronage of Jerome; still the Vulgate itself remains, in the main, a sound and pure version of Holy Writ: witness the Translator's Preface of 1611:—"There were also, within a few hundred years after Christ, translations, many into the Latin tongue, for this tongue also was very fit to convey the Law and the Gospel by, because in those times very many countries of the West, yea, of the South-east and North, spoke or understood Latin, being made provinces to the Romans.

But now the Latin translations were too many to be all good, for they were infinite (*Latini interpretes nullo modo numerari possunt*, saith S. Augustine). Again, they were not out of the Hebrew fountain (we speak of the Latin translations of the Old Testament), but out of the Greek stream; therefore, the Greek being not altogether clear, the Latin derived from it must needs be muddy. This moved S. Hierome, a most learned father, and the best linguist, without controversy, of his age, or of any that went before him, to undertake the translating of the Old Testament out of the very fountains themselves, which he performed with that evidence of great learning, judgment, industry, and faithfulness, that he hath for ever bound the Church unto him in a debt of especial remembrance and thankfulness."

The Latin translations here referred to were made from the LXX. and the *Itala*, seems to have been very ancient. Jerome calls it *usitata vulgata communis.* As to the claim of the Roman Church that the Vulgate is inspired, we observe that for six hundred years after Christ no such claim was put forward for the Latin version. Lactantius, Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome used different Latin versions. Moreover, the present Latin Bible is not all the work of Jerome. Psalms, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, etc., were not translated by him. Some of the errors are noteworthy. Gen. iii. 15: *ipsa conteret*, "she shall bruise." Gen. vi. 6, reads thus: *intenta ad malum cogitatio*, and so extenuates "original sin." St. Luke i. 28, *plena gratia* for *gratis dilecta*, "full of grace," for "freely beloved." Eph. ii. 10, *Creati in bonis operibus* for *ad bona opera.*

We may indeed conclude with Augustine: *Ut cunque est ei linguæ magis credatur unde est in aliam per interpretes facta translatio.*

With Ambrose: *Ita in Graecis codicibus invenimus quorum prior est auctoritas.*

With Jerome himself: *Ut veterum librorum fides de Hebraeis Voluminibus examinanda est ita Novorum Graeci sermonis formam desiderat.* "As the credit of the Old Testament must be examined by the Hebrew volumes, so also in the New by the Greek."

It would be impossible within the time at my disposal, to present you with anything like a critical examination of the textual inaccuracies of the Latin version. Jerome's version was, in fact, far from being perfect, but when it had been used for ages for liturgical purposes, when it had been altered, and corrected, and amended by Cassiodorus, 6th century; Alcuin, 802; Lanfranc, 1089; Nicolaus, 1150; the Sorbonne and Cardinal Ximenes, 1502-17; the Tridentine version was different indeed from that edited by Jerome.

The fundamental defect of the Wickliffite versions was that they were derived from the Latin, and the translators were not able even to consult the original texts, yet those versions have exercised a direct influence for good on all subsequent translations of the Bible into English, and have indirectly influenced the development of the whole English language. It is also an interesting fact that the first printed work of any consequence which issued from the press of Gutenberg at Mayence, in 1455, was the Latin Bible, known to fame as the Mazarin Bible.

Even since Trent, Sixtus V. in A.D. 1590, and Clement VIII. in A D. 1592, have issued revised versions of the text.

It is an instructive comment on papal infallibility that Rome cannot even decide on the subject of the inspired Canon. Sixtus V. in 1590 affirmed the plenary authority of HIS version for all time, and two years later another edition appeared with improvements and corrections. And the preface was written by Bellarmine, who had given the Jesuitical advice that, the text "should be corrected with all possible speed, and the Bible reprinted under the name of Sixtus, with a prefatory note to the effect that errors had crept into the former edition by the carelessness of the printers." So much for the honesty of the Vatican!

Gieseler, writing of the period between 1073 and 1305, says: "The text of the Latin Vulgate, which stood in the place of the original text, was much corrupted by ignorance of criticism, and the attempts to mend it only increased the confusion" (Gieseler, "Ecc. Hist." iii., p. 311).

About 1144 Cardinal Nicolaus complains (Hody, p. 417): "*Exemplaria quæ a doctissimis viris dicebantur correcta adeo discrepabant ut pæne quot codices tot exemplaria reperirem.*"

The Council of Trent appointed a committee to report on the text of the Vulgate. "The commission reported (17th March) that the text was in so dreadful a condition that the Pope alone was competent to correct it" (Hävernick, "Introd. to the Old Test.," p. 355).

Clement's edition has continued to be the normal version in the Roman Catholic Church down to the present, of which all later editions are transcripts, reproducing accurately the most evident mistakes.

In modern times Rome has availed herself of the support of the Vulgate with no niggard hand. Mariolatry is defended from Gen. iii. 15; saint worship from Job v. 1; image worship from Ps. xcviii. 5, Heb. xi. 21. The Douay translates St. John ii. 4: "Woman, what is that to me and thee?" A somewhat similar construction is found elsewhere in the Bible thirteen times, and these passages the Vulgate renders in the same way, although the result is often ludicrous. Josh. xxii. 24, Judges xi. 12, 2 Sam. xvi. 10, 1 Kings xvii. 18, 2 Kings ix. 19, Ez. iv. 3, Hos. xiv. 9, Joel iii. 4, Matt. viii. 29, and xxvii. 19, Mark viii. 7, Luke viii. 28, and iv. 34, Mark i. 24. All these passages the Douay now translates as we do, but still adheres to the mistranslation of St. John ii. 4 to advance Mariolatry. And so on.

Then the translations of more modern date reproduce the Latin errors with minute accuracy, and the notes added to popular editions do not minimise the force of those passages when they tell in favour of some distinctive Romish tenets. Those versions deserving most attention are the Douay New Testament (1582), Old Testament (1609); De Saci (French), 1667; Martini (Italian), 1769; Pereira (Portuguese), 1781; Seio (Spanish), 1794-7.

The following extract may be taken as fairly expressive of Roman Catholic opinion on the question we are considering: it occurs in the preface to the version of Fray Anselmo Petite, Madrid, 1804:—"As regards our having made this version from the Vulgate in preference to the Greek copies, besides the impossibility of proceeding otherwise, being ignorant of the Greek language, we had another powerful reason, which I believe even the most impassioned will not dispute. Not by any means to disparage the authority and the respect which are due to those copies, where they are not corrupted, it is evident that, after the holy Council of Trent declared the Latin Vulgate Bible to be authentic, there is no other of equal authority."

We must bear in mind, however, that, when we speak of the imperfections of such versions as those we have named above, no one can for a moment believe that men like De Saci winked at corruptions, knowing them to be such. His version is one of which it has been truly said that it was written "on bended knee," and its faults are due to the Latin source, not to the honesty or ability of its authors.

The Douay translation has of late approximated more nearly to our version of 1611, but at first the Rhemists and Douay translators obscured their work with many curious terms, as Archisynagogue, azymos, charactro, didrachme, euroaquilo, exinanited, neophyte, paraclete, parasceve, repropitiate, Rhamnus, prepuce, hostes, victimes, holocaust, bread of proposition, which they justify on the grounds "that the words of the Scripture are more sacred."

Among the versions made from the Vulgate, the Bordeaux New Testament claims special notice: "*Le Nouveau Testament de notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, traduit de Latin en François par les Theologiens de Louvain: Imprime a Bordeaux chez Jacques Mongiron: Millanges, Imprimeur du Roi et du College,* 1686, *avec approbation et permission.*

It was the work of the Jesuits and was worthy of its parentage.

"No man," says Bishop Kidder, "will in other cases trust a cheat or a forger of testaments and deeds. But how must this wickedness be when the holy oracles of God are corrupted to serve a turn."

Here are a few specimens, Acts xiii. 2, "*Comme ils offroient au Seigneur le sacrifice de la Messe et qu'ils jeunoient,*" while they offered to the Lord the sacrifice of the Mass, &c.

When Veron was asked the reason of this audacious interpolation he replied coolly, "Because he had often been asked by Calvinists what Scripture affirmed that the Apostles said Mass."

1 Cor. iii. 15: "*Si l'œuvre de quelqu'un brule il en portera la perte, mais il sera sauve quant à luy ainsi toutefois comme par le feu du purgatoire*"—"But he shall be saved by the fire of purgatory."

2 Cor. vi. 14: "*Ne vous joignez point par sacrament de Mariage avec les infidelles*"—"Do not join yourselves to infidels by the sacrament of marriage."

1 Tim. iv. 1: "*Or l'esprit dit clairemont qu'en*

derniers temps quelques uns se separeront de la foy Romaine"—"In the latter time some shall separate from the Roman faith."

Luke iv. 8: "*Serviras de latrie a luy seul*"—"Thou shalt serve Him only with latria."

These are but a few specimens, which show, however, the spirit of the whole.

The doctors of Louvain in 1662 issued another edition with still bolder forgeries, viz.:—St. Matt. xxvi. 27: "Drink ye all *twelve* of it"; St. Mark xiv. 23: "And all the twelve drank of it." (See a paper by the present writer in *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, October, 1876; also "Littledale's Plain Reasons," p. 127.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE CHANGE IN THE BLACK RUBRIC MADE IN 1662—ITS MEANING AND EFFECT.

SIR,—A great deal has been made of this change of phrase. It has been said that the change of meaning is great; and, more strange still, that the effect of the change is actually to enjoin in 1662 what was forbidden expressly in the former Black Rubric in Edward VI.'s Prayer Book.

2. I will first show that there was no change of meaning at all: "real and essential" in Edward's book meaning exactly the same as "corporal" in the book of 1662. How do I prove this? Because in Edward's 28th Article we have, for the same meaning, "real and bodily," which, of course, has the same import as "corporal." To suppose that the same men would condemn a presence in the Black Rubric, calling it "real and essential," and again in an Article calling it "real and bodily," meaning two different things, is absurd and inconceivable. But as bodily is the same as corporal, and real and essential the same as bodily, I may conclude that real and essential of Edward's Rubric was intended to mean exactly the same as corporal of 1662.

3. But, it may be asked, why, if the expressions meant the same, real and essential was changed into corporal? Because, in the lapse of a hundred years, real had ceased to mean strictly substantial, and had become merely the opposite to imaginary. Ridley had certainly a part in the drawing up of Edward's Rubric and Articles. Now he firmly believed that our Lord's body is present by spirit and grace with the elements, as he told his judges. He could not then have meant, by denying a real presence, to deny anything but a corporal presence. Thus, though what Edward's Rubric and Article denied was only a corporal presence, still, as real had now come to be opposed to imaginary, the divines of 1662, who held a real presence of virtue and grace, from Christ's Body in Heaven, would not deny this real presence, and therefore they confined their denial to a corporal presence.

4. I have shown that the meaning of both Rubrics is exactly the same. But I have also to show that it is now asserted, that, by substituting "corporal" for "real and essential," the new Black Rubric, forbidding only the adoration of a corporal presence, virtually enjoins the adoration of a real and essential presence. You, and your readers, may well start at such law and logic as this. At that rate, if a law is changed so as no longer to forbid Romish territorial episcopal titles, it actually enjoins them to be used. At this rate, if an old law condemning pocket-picking was made to condemn house-breaking instead, it might be said actually to enjoin pocket-picking. You may ask, is such absurd arguing possible? I will prove it to you out of the pages of our weekly Church paper. I observe that, in a late number, you praise the proprietor for his spirit in gradually raising it from a monthly to a weekly, and in reducing its price from 3d. to 1d. You say that it "takes a foremost rank amongst Church papers; its articles and views being largely quoted in almost all parts of the civilised world." All this is most true; and I will add further in its praise, that so long as the former proprietor lived, for thirty years, it boldly upheld episcopacy, the grace of both sacraments, and the authority of the primitive Church. But, alas! at the beginning of this year, "a change came o'er the spirit of its dream." On December 4th, 1886, an editorial article declared that adoration of our Lord's natural body, present under the species of bread and wine, is fairly to be based on Scripture. "Natural body," I say, for so the Black Rubric describes our Lord's body; and there cannot at the same time be two bodies, a natural body and a spiritual. This defence of adoration of His natural body, present on the altar, has never been disavowed. No retractation has been made. And yet our remonstrances have done something. We have driven open popish assertions under the surface. We have muzzled its open avowers. But that is all! No retractation! Popish questions are not to be re-opened. Whether there is any secret understanding with Archbishop Walsh, I know not. I can only speak of what I see. Neither will I say that our weekly paper is in the pay of the English Ritualists. All I know is that, not long ago, it said that it could not reduce its price unless its circulation rose to three or four times what it is. Now, at once, it announces that the reduction of price will take place with the new year. This requires some other explanation, unless we are to believe that the money is to come from England. The new popish tone, the editor told us, has gained him English support. Irish support it would only lose him—the case seems plain.

But I am to do more than show that the pretence is vain, that the Black Rubric has been changed. I have to state that a writer in this paper tells us that the present Black Rubric "virtually enjoins adoration of the real and essential presence." This was in a letter of February 17. It has never been disavowed by the editor.

5. I have now done. I have shown that, with the alteration of a word, the two Black Rubrics are identical, denying a corporal, or a real and essential presence, as then understood, and declaring such adoration to be idolatrous. I also maintain that it is perfectly monstrous to pretend that the change of a word in a law can be forced into an enjoining of what was before forbidden. This would be so, even if the offence treated of was not exactly the same in both laws. But, as I have shown that the corporal presence of the 1662 Rubric is exactly the same as the "real and essential" and "real and bodily" of Edward's Rubric and Article, the pretence that the verbal change, without change of meaning, was a virtual enjoining of adoration, is about the most extraordinary and unfounded assertion that I ever met with in my long study of theolo-

gical controversial writings. Of course an editor is more responsible for his own articles than for letters. In this case, alas! he has to answer for too much: "adoration of a body, which the Church denies to be present—this fairly based on Scripture—a presence in ninety places at once, actual contact with our Lord's perfect manhood." All this is in editorial *dicta.* But as to letters, I think that, as the editor says, he will admit only such "schools of thought as may legitimately exist within the Church," he is fairly responsible, when he gives his readers, without protest, letters which turn into ridicule a Rubric which our Synod not only retained, but tried to strengthen; letters which declare that an adoration is enjoined, which the Prayer Book forbids as idolatrous. I praise this paper as it was. I condemn it as it now is. *Quam mutatus ab illo!*

I have said above that I do not assert a treaty between Archbishop Walsh and our weekly Church paper. I was not present, and can assert nothing. At any rate, the world is so full of knaves and fools, as Carlyle says, that it is impossible to guess. But Archbishop Walsh is no fool. Had there been a treaty, matters could not have been better managed than they have. For three or four months from the beginning of the year, Popery was sown broadcast in our clerical mind. Remonstrance was in vain. Any good seed we offered was flung back in our faces. The seed-time over, the ground was carefully raked and rolled. The tares must be left to fructify. If we now interfere, the ground cannot be disturbed, Popish questions cannot be re-opened. What better could Mary do at her accession? Gardiner and Bonner preached; and the controversy cannot be re-opened. What better could Father Petre do on King James' accession? He taught the adoration of a Presence in ninety places at once, and an actual contact. And James would not have the question re-opened. See Burnett's "Own Times."

6. I hope your readers will not think this a personal matter, or a mere Irish question. It is neither one nor the other. It is a simple protest against Popery, as to the Presence. Our weekly paper, after editorially asserting a Presence of Christ's natural Body--for natural it is, if the Prayer Book be true—nailed their colours to the mast. It refuses now to re-open the case. But it never heard it at all. The judge pronounced his decision, "fairly based on Scripture," then closed the case and hunted us out of court. We besought it to retract. So far from it, it reasserted it, and boasted that such doctrine gained it support over with you. Every insult and epithet was heaped on us—"new Titus Oates," "wicked designs," "spiteful attempts," "misrepresentation," "a fierce grimalkin," etc., etc. Why all this Billingsgate? It is useless! It can prove neither a local Presence of a natural Body, nor that the adoration thereof is enjoined by the new Black Rubric. And yet it is not *quite* useless. It shows that my arguments are unanswerable; for it is only in that case that any sensible opponent resorts to vituperation. But why was I thus reviled? Simply because I attempted to controvert plain popery. Every one attempting the same was also boycotted. This paper will not pull down the Popish flag, nor allow any one else to say a word against it. Am I to be silent, lest it should be said, "it is a personal matter"? God forbid! Ridley and Philpot might as well be accused of personal motives, when they died protesting against Popery. Neither is it a mere Irish question. Adoration of a natural Body is as much a question for you as for us. In fact it began with you. If the *Church Times* has not had the effrontery to say that the Black Rubric of 1662 "virtually enjoins adoration of the real and essential Presence," it threw contempt upon that Rubric, and plainly asserted that Trent and our 28th Article are in harmony. All this tends to Popish adoration. If our own weekly paper would admit my protests, I need not appeal to you, or to our secular papers. But a protest must be made, unless we are to sit down under Roman utterances. We can only make it in such papers as will admit us, and may God reward them for doing so!

7. I have torn to tatters the idea that an adorable corporal Presence is sanctioned, or not condemned, by our formularies. I say "a corporal Presence," for there can be no other, except one of spirit and grace, which no one would adore. Still more, I have exposed the monstrous position, that adoration of any such Presence is virtually sanctioned. And now I would stop, but that I must really say a word upon the spirit of dishonesty which is spreading itself over our Church and people in both countries. I think it is worse than any false doctrine. Whether to call it Jesuitical or not, it is certainly a lying spirit, which openly denies what it professes to believe. I do not say that all who hold this adorable corporal Presence ought to go over to Rome. Many of them object to other dogmas of Rome, which they say they cannot swallow, at least at present. I trust there are few of them that, like a late "working man" in the *Church Times*, laments that our disunion from Rome prevents our adopting the novelties of the Vatican Council. Those who disbelieve our Church's decisions as to corporal Presence and adoration thereof, should at least cease from asserting the contrary. Decency requires so much. But what shall I say of our clergy, who, in periodicals, as editors or writers, assert what, by their anticipations, they deny? or who, having once asserted these things, still, after exposure, refuse to retract them? No words are strong enough to express one's condemnation of such dishonesty. It is enough to bring down God's judgments upon our Church, so long as we condone such shameless falsehood. If our 4th Article and Black Rubric be false, let clergymen who subscribe them at least refrain from contradicting them. Let them hide their dishonesty. By uttering it they only expose themselves to the contempt of all honourable men. As to most doctrines, honest men may differ. But all agree that a man should believe what he asserts, and that it is in the last degree shameful now to contravert what yesterday, for preferment, one has declared that he believes. If it were only the periodicals and the clergy that prophesied falsely, it would not be so bad. The climax comes when "my people will have it so." Then the sentence is fulfilled, "*vult decipi, decipietur.*"

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V. G. of Kildare.

◆

THE CONTINUITY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

SIR,—*A propos* of Dr. Plummer's able paper in the last number of the PULPIT, may I mention an illustrative circumstance of recent occurrence. A few years since there expired a lease of Church lands granted in the time of King Alfred for the period of

999 years. The holding of such a prolonged lease is usually deemed equivalent to absolute ownership. Not so, however, in this instance: for a judicial decision declared that the lands must now revert to the Church. The Church of England was thus legally recognised as a corporation which had been in existence for at least 1,000 years.

H. HEBER EVANS.

December 5th, 1887.

◆

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." December, 1887. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

CANON WESTCOTT concludes his articles on the Revised Version with a paper showing how that careful attention to tenses, etc., which the revisers showed, throws light upon the Christian life.

Dr. Marcus Dods has an excellent paper on "Malachi." Dr. Dods is quite right, we think, when he says, "Malachi was face to face with a generation characterised by scepticism and insensibility to moral distinctions'; and we fear he would be quite right if he said it of the present generation. But we strongly object to his epigrammatical description of the book of Ecclesiastes as "a sceptic's handbook or cynic's *vade mecum*." The book of Ecclesiastes is nothing of the kind. However, this is only an *obiter dictum*, and allowances must be made for epigrams.

Professor Findlay holds that Titus was *not* circumcised. We *think* so, but we are still not sure. St. Paul could quote "case law" to the Corinthians—"we have no such custom"—why did he not quote this "leading case"? On the other hand, if St. Paul yielded, what argument enforced him? But we shall not live till this controversy is settled, not even the youngest of us.

Of Professor Cheyne's article on the Revised Version of the Book of Isaiah, we can only say that we have made a note of it for future reference. And that will be soon, for Isaiah cannot be read too often. Isaiah in the Hebrew alone repays the work of learning Hebrew.

The editor promises an excellent programme for 1888; if the articles are as good next year as they have been this, we shall be quite content.

◆

"SOLOMON: HIS LIFE AND TIMES." By Ven. Archdeacon F. W. Farrar, D.D. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1887. Price 2s. 6d.

THIS is a welcome addition to the "Men of the Bible" series. The fame of Solomon is so great that we are astonished when we reflect how few definite facts can be ascertained as to his history, and it is no fault of the author that so large a portion of his work is based on supposition and conjecture. In his own words, "the glory of Solomon vanished like an unsubstantial pageant, and left nothing behind it but a vague memory."

In the first part of the book is given a vivid description of the closing events of the reign of David. This, and the chapter which introduces the reign of Solomon define very clearly the religious and political position of the Jewish kingdom at that time.

We think that one-fifth of the book was too much to devote to the buildings of Solomon, the form of which rests so entirely on conjecture, but the subject is an enticing one.

The chapter which treats of the decline of Solomon is perhaps the best in the book: it is, unhappily, the portion of his life as to which there is least doubt. Who can help feeling a deep interest with regard to the question of his repentance, yet the author rightly reminds us that "discussions about the salvation of this man or that man are futile. God, not man, is the judge."

The remainder of the work deals mainly with the writings of Solomon, and will be of more interest to the student than to the general reader.

We suppose the idea that Solomon was the author of Ecclesiastics must be given up; but it comes so naturally as a sequel to his life that we cannot help thinking it must have been written with the intention of having a direct reference to that life rather than with the wider intention that it suggested.

With every word the author has to say about the Song of Songs we entirely agree.

We have no hesitation in recommending the book to our readers.

◆

"THE CHRISTIAN FULFILMENTS AND USES OF THE LEVITICAL SIN-OFFERING." By the Rev. Henry Batchelor. London: James Nisbet and Co. 1887. Pp. 169. Price 5s.

THIS work will be highly interesting to our theological readers. It exhibits throughout much deep thought and earnest investigation on the subjects of the Levitical and Christian Atonement. The author shows that man, having broken the revealed Law, is out of favour with God, and this necessitates the substitution of the Life, which is the Blood, as a covering for sin. The Hebrew verb, signifying to atone, propitiate, to cover, includes the idea of substitution. Mr. Batchelor expresses with great clearness the blessed truth that "Atonement in Leviticus and in the Gospel is a finished interposition on behalf of the sinner. It was something done and complete. When the animal was slain, and the blood offered, that was the end of the transaction." "To the soul burthened and crushed by the sense of its sins, this is the indispensable truth. It is, of all others, the most precious, There is immediate and absolute deliverance in Christ. The Lord Jesus has covered, obliterated sin for every soul that simply trusts in Him. The past can never accuse and condemn the soul any more that hides itself in the Son of God and Saviour of the world." We can highly recommend this volume, which is moderate in size, with large clear type, as a valuable addition to the theological library, as well as to that of the general reader.

◆

AN exhibition and sale of offerings of all kinds to commemorate the Free and Open Church Society's thirty years' protest against the pew-exclusion of the masses from their parish churches, is to be held early in next year (1888), in the Town-hall, Kensington. The appeal for this Thanksgiving Sale of Work is made to all who care for Church Defence, on the following grounds:—1. It is certain that the House of Commons, after this Parliament, will disendow the Church, unless she is made really (not in name only) the Church of the People, instead of being for a small minority of well-to-do seat-allottees. Because "if a majority of electors pronounce in favour of Disestablishment, Disestablishment must follow." What else can be expected from that majority, shut out, as they are, from the religious services which the Establishment intends for all alike? 2. We cannot raise money in any other way for our work in every parish—of (*a*) convincing the pew-holders of the ruin they are bringing about; and (*b*) "making the body of the people feel the value of the Church's existence, and understand that the Church is their own," though they are despoiled of it for a time. It is hoped that churches so thrown open to the people since this movement began—which seldom receives their offertories—will display some gratitude for the blessings it has secured to them, by sending either money or exhibits, however trifling individually, to a collection as various as the tastes, trade, and abilities of the donors. Communications (andsubscriptions) requested to the Org. Secretary, R.A. Briggs (Archt.), A.R.I.B,A., 2, Devonshire Square, E.C.

A SUCCESSFUL meeting was held on behalf of the Bishop of St. Albans' Fund for the East End of London, on the 26th ult., at Copped Hall, Totteridge, the residence of Mr. S. B. Boulton, who took the chair, and gave his experience of the working of the fund from a layman's point of view. He was followed by the Bishops of St. Albans and Colchester, by Canon Boyd, Principal of Hertford College, Oxford, himself a distinguished pioneer in the spiritual work carried on in "London over the border," and by Archdeacon Lawrence and Canon Procter, the secretary of the fund. An East End clergyman, the Rev. C. J. Buckley, excited the sympathies of the audience by an account of the present state of the work, the early beginnings and struggles of which had been graphically described by Canon Boyd. The principal residents in the parish and the neighbourhood, and a large number of the clergy of the diocese attended to show their sympathy with their Bishop in his difficulties, and to support his plea on behalf of the St. Albans' Fund. On the following day two sermons were preached in Totteridge Church for the same object, that in the morning by the Bishop of Colchester, that in the evening by Canon Boyd. The collection at the meeting amounted to £164 2s. 5d., and the two offertories to £19 7s. 6d., making a total of £183 9s. 11d.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barrass, Rev. J. Stephen, Organising Secretary of the Church of England Young Men's Society; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of London.

Bockett, Rev. Edward Arthur Bradney, M.A., Rector of South Moreton, Berks.

Buckley, Rev. Felix John, Rector of Stanton St. Quintin, Wilts; Honorary Canon of Bristol Cathedral.

Chadwick, Rev. Robert, M.A., Curate of Middle Claydon, Bucks; Vicar of Chilvers Coton, Nuneaton, Warwickshire.

Corfield, Rev. Claud Evelyn Lacy, M.A., Rector of Heanor; Acting Chaplain 1st Volunteer Battalion, Sherwood Foresters, Derbyshire Regiment.

Cox, Rev. Frederick, Curate-in-Charge of St. James's Chapel, Clifton.

Davies, Rev. Frederick Charles, M.A., Vicar of Ketteringham, Norfolk.

Ellaby, Rev. Alfred Hall, Vicar of Hales; Rector of Little Eversden, near Cambridge.

Farmer, Rev. Charles Henry, B.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Hitchin; Vicar of Silsoe, Beds.

Glascott, Rev. William Edward, M.A., Vicar of Brill-with-Bourstall, Bucks.

Goodenough, Rev. George, Chaplain to the *Northumberland.*

Hall, Rev. Herbert E., Vicar of St. Benet and All Saints', Kentish Town.

Harford-Battersby, Rev. G., late Curate of All Saints', South Lambeth; Rector of Middle Claydon and Vicar of East Claydon, Buckinghamshire.

Hill, Rev. Frederick Henry, M.A., Rector of Cranfield, Beds.

Laws, Rev. G. E., Curate of Emmanuel, Clifton; Vicar of St. Clement's, Bristol.

Leach, Rev. Robert, Vicar of St. Silas's, Penton Street, Pentonville.

Lewis, Rev. Henry Ardern, M.A., Vicar of Trelleck, Chepstow.

Little, Rev. Emilius G. H., Curate of St. Michael's, Paddington; Incumbent of All Saints', Inverary, N.B.

Lucas, Rev. F. G. L., Rector of Ashstead, Surrey.

Lunn, Rev. Herbert, Precentor and Minor Canon of Ripon Cathedral; Vicar of Dacre, Yorkshire.

Mildmay, Rev. Charles Arundell St. John, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Oxford.

Mullins, Rev. C. R., Chaplain to the *Defiance.*

Peake, Rev. E. C., Rector of Ashstead, Surrey; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for West Surrey and the Channel Islands, and Curate of Stoke D'Abernon.

Player, Rev. J. E., Rector of Wells, Norfolk; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Purton, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Shurdington, Gloucestershire.

Sandwith, Rev. William Fitzgerald Gambier, B.A., Vicar of Holkham, Norfolk.

Selwyn, Rev. E. J., Rector of Pluckley; Rural Dean of East Charing.

Smith, Rev. William Morley, M.A., Rector of Homersfield with St. Cross, South Elmham, Suffolk.

Stephen, Rev. William Duguid, M.A., Rector of Little Wilbraham; Rector of Landbeach, Cambridgeshire.

Weldon, Rev. Lewen Burton, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Andrew's, Kinson, Dorset.

Wilson, Rev. Cyril Fitzroy, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Edmonton; Rector of Stowlangtoft, Suffolk.

Wood, Rev. Richard, Rector of Great Harborough; Vicar of Elton.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Crosthwaite, Rev. Benjamin, M.A., the Vicar of Knaresborough, and Honorary Canon of Ripon, at the Rectory, Bolton Percy, Yorkshire, on the 2nd inst., aged 85.

Fawcett, Rev. John, Chaplain of the Poplar and Stepney Sick Asylum and Union Workhouse, at the London Fever Hospital, of scarlet fever, on the 29th ult., aged 68.

Giles, Rev. Edwin, at Riseley Vicarage, Bedford, on the 4th inst., aged 41.

Kirk, Rev. Charles, M.A., one of H.M. Indian Chaplains Bombay Presidency, on the 11th ult., aged 52 years.

Knight, Rev. Henry Charles, J.P., of Barrels, at Heathlands, Welland, on the 1st inst., aged 74.

Palmer-Samborne, Rev. Richard Lane, M.A., J.P., thirty-two years Rector of Ashreigny, at Brighton, on the 17th ult., aged 59.

Pulling, Rev. John Lenton, M.A., LL.D., of 61, Lee Terrace, Blackheath, on the 23rd ult., aged 52.

Scott, Rev. Robert, D.D., Dean of Rochester, late Master of Balliol College, at the Deanery, Rochester, on the 2nd inst., aged 76.

Shebbeare, Rev. Charles Hooper, M.A., Univ. Coll., Oxford, for thirty-four years Vicar of Wykeham, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, at Bath (after a brief illness), on Sunday, the 20th ult., in the 64th year of his age.

Trotter, Rev. Coutts, M.A., Vice-Master and Fellow of Trinity College, at Cambridge, on the 4th inst., aged 50.

Wood, Rev. Charles James, M.A., formerly Fellow of B.N.C., Oxford, at 6, Craufurd Terrace, on the 27th ult., aged 56.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE UNJUST STEWARD.

By the Ven. Archdeacon BARDSLEY (Bishop designate of Sodor and Man).

Sermon preached at St. Mary's, Edgehill, Liverpool, August 7th, 1887.

"And the Lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations."—Luke xvi. 8, 9.

THE parable of the unjust steward is without doubt not an easy subject to preach about. It follows the parable of the prodigal son, and seems to have been spoken on the same occasion; but it would not be possible to imagine two parables presenting a greater contrast. The parable of the prodigal son is full of evangelical truth—so simple, so touching, that we recur to it again and again; and in our latest moments, our expressions are that we too, like the prodigal son looking to the Father in heaven, may expect mercy at His hands, though we are not worthy to be called His sons. But the parable of the unjust steward—why, it seems to teach trickery and to commend cheating. "The Lord commended the unjust steward." Does it not seem to justify the taunt of Julian the Apostate, that this is opposed to all righteousness and fair dealing? It comes before us in the service of this day, and therefore it is only right that we this morning, remembering this is none other than the teaching of Jesus Christ, who was the Just One, should seek to understand in some degree, the lesson our Lord intended us to learn. Commentators have racked their heads to find an explanation. There are those who take the lowest and material ground, and say that this is a parable of earthly life intended to teach worldly wisdom; that our Lord intended those around Him to gather that it was well to make friends with rich people, so that if the world went against them they might have friends to go to, who would receive them into their habitations and keep them from starving. This is a miserable view to take. On the other hand, some have spiritualised this parable, and say it means simply that we are to forgive one another their trespasses, then we shall be good friends and by-and-bye meet in the eternal paradise. There is just one little difficulty in this exposition, and it is that contained in the words of the text, "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." There is nothing there about forgiveness of sin, but the commentator quietly drops out the mammon of unrighteousness and says, "I omit these words because I do not think Christ made use of them." There will be no difficulty in making plain any part of Scripture if we care to do this; but I take it that "the mammon of unrighteousness," meets us fairly in the face: "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness that, when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations."

Now the "mammon of unrighteousness" means money. Why should we disguise it? And what our Lord tells his disciples is that whether they have little or much, they have to make a right use of it. One use they can make of it is, in some way doing good to others to make themselves friends, so that when they have passed from this troublesome world and arrived on the eternal shore, they will find those gone before who will be ready to receive them into the everlasting habitation.

Money may be called the "mammon of unrighteousness," as it is frequently in this world the wages of sin. A novelist has written the "History of a Shilling," and it is possible there is no coin in your pocket which may not have been put to sinful uses. Moreover, money may be called the "mammon of unrighteousness," because it deceives us. It is not like the true riches, which never fail, but it takes to itself wings, and, just when we are building most upon it, and resting our hopes in it, we are deceived, and have to say, "it is the mammon of unrighteousness."

It is this money—not evil in itself (for it is God's gift)—that is so often put to unholy uses, which is the "mammon of unrighteousness," and it deceives those who put their trust in it. And yet we may actually find friends through it who will give us a welcome when we reach the heavenly shore. Remember, if this seems low teaching, it is the teaching of Jesus Christ. Our Lord does not here say we are to get to heaven by our money. He is not laying down a canon for the use of money for the world at large, but He is speaking to His disciples. Very often in the chase, the scent is lost, when it is overrun; and in some parts of God's Word, commentators lose the scent, because they overrun it. People have taken this parable and applied it to the world at large, forgetting that the Lord only said this to His disciples, and He tells them that, whilst here in this world—as regards the money entrusted to them as stewards—they are to make a right use of it. "If you want an example of prudence, go to the children of this world," the Lord seems to say. "Do not you remember that unjust steward, that clever scoundrel; how he managed it when he was turned out of his stewardship. He had so compromised his friends, who pitied him on account of his lost position, that he found those who were willing to take him in and keep him from starving. Even the lord of the unjust steward could not help admiring his prudence. So our Lord says "the children of this world are wiser than the children of light. Therefore I say unto you (disciples) make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations"; that they may receive you, not into an earthly house for a few days until you can be on your legs again, but into an everlasting paradise. He says, "Look at the men of this world; how keen they are; never lose a chance, embrace every opportunity; yet you, the children of light, who are looking forward to a better world, how careless you are—how slothful. The children of this world are to be admired, for they are wiser as regards this generation than you, My disciples." Granting that the parable is limited, that He is drawing an example and rebuking them by the world around, you may still say to me when you grapple with the text, "Is it not low ground that Christ takes when He tells His disciples they should so use their money as to make friends with it to receive them into everlasting habitations. It is not the highest ground—for this is the great charm of our Lord's parables—they are so natural. We are afraid to speak of certain aspects of the truth for fear they should be misunderstood; but the truth that came to Him He enforced, and with the motives that first came to His mind. Just as if you or I had to deal with some poor drunkard. We might take him on the highest ground, and say, "Dear brother, no drunkard can enter the kingdom of heaven:" or, "Do you know Christ died for you?" We might appeal to him on this ground; but surely we might take a lower standpoint, and say, "Think of the way you are breaking your wife's heart;" or, "Think of your children, who are half-fed and poorly clothed." It would be lower, but right ground. Or again, we might say "How foolish you are, squandering your money, spending all you have." "The lowest ground," you say. Why not? We do not omit the highest. So Christ, in dealing with His disciples, was perfectly natural, taking His illustrations from the world. Even as regards money, then, we may make such a good use of it as that our entrance into the kingdom of heaven may be an "abundant entrance." Surely this is the ground taken by St. Paul. Writing to Timothy, he says: "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." If this teaching were not St. Paul's we might be afraid to follow it. Some will say, You are preaching salvation by works. We preach justification by faith, but we have been so afraid of the Church of Rome that we have feared to bring out salvation by works. But there must be good works to test the reality of the faith, which is known by its fruit; and it is our Lord who says that in the judgment of the last day the question will not be, What do you think, or what do you believe? but What did you do? How did you live? When we are brought before the great tribunal, and Christ sees before Him those who have never visited the sick; never given garments to the naked, nor bread to the hungry—no matter what they thought—it will be, "Depart!" On the other hand, to those who have practised works of mercy for Christ, though they may think they have done nothing, it will be, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me." This is Christ's great law at the last, and we are not to be deterred from preaching the necessity for good works, which spring out of lively faith in Christ and love for His people, and for which there will be a glorious reward.

That "they may receive you into everlasting habitations." We do not enter heaven because of our good works; but the character of our entrance depends upon good works. It is what St. Peter calls "an abundant entrance" (2 Peter i. 11). I can picture to myself on a winter's night, the wind blowing coldly, snow falling fast—a poor outcast comes to a wayside house, at the door of which he knocks tremblingly. The door is opened, and he is taken in for the night. By-and-bye there is a sound of wheels, and a light appears in every window; the sound of music is heard, and all rush to the door. It is the eldest son come back from foreign parts. What a difference! For him there is an abundant entrance; and, thank God, so it will be in regard to His children. The door of heaven will never be closed against those who ask for mercy; but to have friends there waiting to greet and receive you into everlasting habitations—it is this that seems to have impressed itself upon one of our sweetest singers, who thus describes those who reach heaven without a friend:

> Alone! to land alone upon that shore,
> With no one sight that we have seen before;
> Things of a different hue and the sounds all new,
> No forms of earth our fancies to arrange.
> But to begin alone that mighty change!
> Alone! to land alone upon that shore,
> Knowing so well we can return no more,
> No voice or face of friend, none with us to attend
> Our disembarking on that awful strand—
> But to arrive alone in such a land,
> Alone! to land alone upon that shore;
> To begin alone to live for evermore,
> To have no one to teach the manner or the speech
> Of that new life, or put us at our ease,
> Oh! that we might die in pairs or companies!

Yes, we may die alone, but, thank God, we cannot reach heaven alone, because we have a Friend gone before to prepare many mansions. But, oh! if we have been, whilst in this world, using Christ's advice, making to ourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; using money, not selfishly for ourselves, but relieving the sick and needy; in one way or another securing the blessings of the poor and outcast we have succoured—when we reach heaven, oh! to see the faces of those waiting to greet us. It will seem as if we had been there before.

> We will meet more we know,
> Than we can meet below,
> And find our rest, like some returning dove,
> And be at home with our eternal love.

Our Lord knew what He was saying when He appealed to what men call "lower motives." The love of Christ can draw us to heaven. It is that love alone which will make us love our brethren here below; and as faithful friends and stewards, making use of the mammon of unrighteousness, we shall make friends who will receive us into eternal habitations.

◆

THE CHURCH AND DISSENT.

By the Rev. J. J. SHERRARD, B.D., Vicar of Banagher, King's Co., Ireland.

Sermon Preached in Banagher Church on February 20th, 1887.

"There is one body and one spirit."—Ephesians iv. 4.

MANY people thought that when the Irish Church was disestablished and disendowed, that whatever evil such an Act was likely to inflict upon us, at least one great benefit would be secured. Many were of opinion that by this Act the great stumbling-block to the unity and community of all the Protestants in Ireland had been removed; that the time had at last arrived for the union of all the sects; that the Christians in this country would now be reduced to two great divisions—the reformed and the unreformed; and that all other differences would sink and disappear.

It is needless to say this prophecy has not been verified. The disestablishment of our Church, whatever it may have effected towards allaying jealousy, has done very little towards drawing Protestants closer together. On whatever side the fault lies, here we are to-day as far as ever from forming one body, or from holding one common faith.

There are many who think the fault is ours, and who say that we were not sufficiently conciliating; and especially is the Prayer Book blamed for keeping up the divisions between us. That book, it is said, ought to have been revised and corrected until it was brought into a shape that would suit all parties. It is the relics of popery in that book which have prevented the Dissenters from joining us.

Now such a statement seems neither fair nor just. To say that the Prayer Book is the cause of continued disunion is to make two false assumptions.* For if the teaching of any part of the Prayer Book is the cause of the difference and separation between us and Dissenters, why is it that the Dissenters, who have no Prayer Book, are not united among themselves? It cannot be the Prayer Book which keeps them asunder, for all alike reject it. Must it not be, therefore, for this reason, that there is as much difference between some of these bodies among themselves, as there is between them and us? And again, to accuse that book of maintaining the division between us, is to imply that we could alter it so as to please and comprehend them. Here, again, we forget that they are not all united, and that all of them do not object to the same things, but to entirely different things.

In order to comprehend all our Dissenting brethren, let us just see what we should have to alter or omit, and let us see how much of our Prayer Book would be left after engaging in this work of general comprehension. To gain the largest body in this country, the Presbyterians, we should have to dispense with our bishops. The Ordination and Confirmation Services should therefore be blotted out. To gain the various classes of Methodists, we should give up, in addition to the foregoing, many of our Articles and the greater portion of the Church Catechism. The Independents would require a fundamental change in our organisation. To win over the Baptists we should give up Infant Baptism and its Services. To comprehend the Quakers we should sacrifice Adult Baptism and the Holy Communion. To gain the goodwill of the Plymouth Brethren we should cast away all forms of prayer, including the Lord's Prayer, and all distinctions between ministers and people should cease. How much would there be left. We should have a Church bereft of bishops, priests, deacons, sacraments, Liturgy, dioceses, and parishes. The Prayer Book would be completely gone, though we should need more than ever one of its petitions, "Lord, have mercy upon us," in which, however, it is extremely doubtful if the Plymouth Brethren would join.

But suppose you were to go to work on a less extensive scale. Supposing you wished to re-unite with some one of these numerous bodies, say the largest of them, and that you altered your teaching so as to please them. What would you have done? In that case you would not have comprehended them, but they would have comprehended you. We should have given up something, they would have given up nothing. They would not have come over to us, but we should have gone over to them. They would certainly welcome us as desirable converts, but because we delayed so long it is anything but probable that we should be received with the same enthusiasm and rejoicing as was bestowed upon the returning and repentant prodigal.

---

* See Sermon by late J. C. Coghlan, "Doctrine in Danger."

Is it fair, is it reasonable, I ask, to charge the Church with intolerance and illiberality for not going out to meet the sects? Is it fair that the sacrifice should be all on one side? Surely the essence of a compromise is that both parties should yield something; that there should be a mutual give and take? But how does the matter stand? We are asked to give up everything the Dissenters do not like, and on these terms only are we to be acknowledged. We are only to insist on the things we hold in common with them. We are to give up everything which they consider erroneous or unimportant; that is, we are to make all the sacrifices, while they are to make none; we are to submit to any amount of subtraction from our creeds and formularies, but they will suffer no change to be made in theirs. Their creeds must remain intact; they must neither be added to nor subtracted from. I ask, is this a fair kind of request? Is it a reasonable kind of bargain?

Of all the charges that ever were made against our Church, the most unreasonable, the most far-fetched, the one most utterly devoid of a shadow of foundation, is that of illiberality. The terms of Communion required by our Church are the most liberal and the broadest of any in Christendom. We do not ask our laymen to approve of everything in our Prayer Book. We do not ask them to believe in the Divine origin of the ministry; we do not ask them to believe in any kind of scriptural inspiration; we do not ask them to believe in the fall of man, or original sin, or the doctrine of the atonement, or justification by faith, or baptismal regeneration; we do not ask them to approve of our ordinances and ritual; we do not ask their opinions on our Church seasons and services; they may think as they will on any or all of these things, and yet not be put away from her doors. We ask the members of our Church to believe nothing except the most elementary principles of the Christian faith; just that which the apostles believed 1,800 years ago—the faith which has come down to us in the Apostles' Creed—the simple facts of Christ's life, viz.: His incarnation, death, resurrection, ascension, and the judgment of the quick and dead. He who is baptised in that creed is in full communion with our Church. All the privileges she possesses are open to him. She makes no inquiry into anything else. She allows him to think as he pleases on every other subject. The truth of the matter is, that it is the liberality and toleration of the Church which has made people forsake her rather than her illiberality. Many of those who have left her ranks have done so, not because she could not tolerate them, but because they could not tolerate her. It was because she gave too much liberty, and not too little, that they were offended with her; and by going out from her communion, these people are not on that account becoming more liberal than she is; they are becoming distinctly less liberal. They are not joining a broader sect, but a narrower one. Yes, it is just because they could not make the Church as narrow and one-sided as they would wish her to be that they went elsewhere; just because she tolerated something which they could not tolerate that they left her.

There is just one thing, and one thing only, which would justify us in leaving the Church to which we all belong. We ought to leave her if she were to ask us to believe something contrary to God's word; if she were to say to us, You cannot be saved unless you believe or do something that I tell you, but which is not in your Bibles. If we do leave the Church for anything less than that, then we are encouraging schism about which there are so many hard things said in the Bible. No extreme ritual, no ceremonies, no Church decorations or ornaments, no matter how mischievous or misleading we may think them to be, ought to turn us away. We can protest against these things if we dislike them, but Christian forbearance and Christian principle forbids us to do more. Common sense tells us this ought to be so. For if large numbers of men are to be bound together in a society of any kind, you must give them liberty to differ on some things. Above all, in religion it is a mistake to expect absolute uniformity of worship and creed. You must give liberty in things indifferent. Some people like high ritual, some like no ritual at all. Some think surpliced choirs and choral services are a help to devotion; others prefer simple congregational music. Some wish to see figures and symbols and peculiar dresses and ceremonies; others dislike them. There is room for all in the Church. She allows the greatest diversity in matters of this kind; and she is wise and right to do so. For men differ from each other enormously in taste and sentiment. You must allow for these differences. You must, if we are to have a Church at all, give that Church power to accommodate herself to the accidents of time and place. You cannot drive men as you would a flock of sheep.

If, therefore, there is ever to be reunion, the sacrifices must not be all on one side. The sects must come up a little, if they want us to go down. For as a Church there are certain things we cannot give up, whatever liberty we give to individual Christians. We cannot lay aside any portion of the faith which has been handed down to us from the apostles in that creed called by their name. We cannot give up our sacraments which we have received from Christ Himself. We cannot give up our episcopal orders which have been in the Church from her first institution. We cannot give up our claim to be an ancient branch of that Holy Catholic Church throughout the world compared with which the sects date but from yesterday. We cannot, I say, give up these things, because if we did, we should lose more than we should gain. We should be cutting ourselves off from the other branches of the Church in the world, with which at present we are in communion. We should be doing worse than this. We should be sacrificing the truth for the sake of the inferior blessing of unity.

And it is well to remember that our friends the Dissenters have done nothing to call for any great sacrifices on our part. If the truth must be spoken, it is to the Nonconformists of England that we are indebted for the disestablishment and disendowment of our Church. They united with the Romanists of this country in robbing and spoiling us. As far as gratitude is concerned, therefore, we owe them nothing. Still we would be glad to receive them back if they would accept our terms. But they must not expect too much. They must not expect us to yield everything. They must consent to the retention of the motto of the Evangelical prophet: "Look upon Zion the city of our solemnities. Thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall be removed, neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken."

◆

WHY THE LORD DELAYETH HIS COMING.

SERMON BY THE REV. JAMES HAMILTON, B.A.,
VICAR OF DUNBOYNE CHURCH.

SERMON PREACHED IN DUNBOYNE CHURCH, ON ADVENT SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 27TH, 1887.

> "And He spake a parable unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint; saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man: and there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me. And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith. And shall not God avenge His own elect, which cry day and night unto Him, though He bear long with them? I tell you that He will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith upon earth?"—LUKE xviii. 1-8.

IT is evident that this parable of the unjust judge is connected with the discourse in the preceding chapter, concerning our Lord's appearing. Some time ago, you may remember, I preached on the parable of the "Selfish Neighbour," contained in the eleventh chapter of this Gospel. Both parables teach the same important lesson, viz., the wonderful power of importunity to obtain an answer to prayer, even under the most discouraging circumstances. In fact, in the opening words of the parable, we have its point or explanation stated—"And He spake a parable unto them to the end, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint." It may be worthy of notice that it is only here and in verse 9 that the explanation of a parable is given beforehand. But, besides the great lesson of importunate prayer, common to both parables, there is another great subject suggested at the close of the one under consideration. It is the key-note of the season upon which we have just entered—our Lord's Second Coming. Our Lord always hinted that there would be a delay about His Coming, and this delay would have the tendency to cause His followers to lose heart. The object of the parable is, therefore, to encourage them to persevere under all circumstances. That by steadfast perseverance a person is certain to overcome any obstacle. In fact, the case which He has selected presents to our minds circumstances the most unfavourable that could be imagined, whether we regard the person who occupies the seat of justice or the individual who appears before him as a petitioner. The description of the judge is that of a character perfectly abandoned; he neither feared God, we are told, nor regarded man. He was living in utter violation of the two great commandments of the Law. He not only loved neither God nor man, but equally disregarded both. He was an unprincipled, lawless tyrant, devoid of the sense of responsibility, and of every sentiment of humanity and justice. And is it not very sad to think that such a character was not so very uncommon in our Lord's day? It is supposed that it was a too true picture of many of the inferior judges under Herod the king. The person before us is evidently a sample of the very lowest kind. He is not only a character who fears not God nor regards man, but, with a profligate frankness, he acknowledges himself to be quite as bad as other people think him. He glories in his shame. Now this is not the case as a rule. A villain generally tries to stand well with his fellow-men. He hardly ever has the courage to appear before men, or even before himself in his true colours. He contrives, at least when he goes abroad, to assume to be honourable, and upright, and just. This person seems to have lost all self-respect. Men knew him to be a villain, and he appears to laugh at the idea as a good joke. Now, when a man loses his self-respect he has reached the very lowest state of depravity. He has then become utterly abandoned.

This is the character of the judge in the parable to whom this widow has to address her petitions. There could be no more hopeless tribunal from which to obtain a hearing. It would seem to be utterly useless for her to go on pressing her case. Yet she does, and wins.

If we turn now from the judge to the widow, there would appear as little chance of success. Of all classes in the East, widows were the most defenceless and oppressed. They were nearly always a prey to oppressors and knaves of every description. On account of their very helplessness, they were likely to have plenty of adversaries, if they had anything to lose. Their property was often confiscated under the garb of piety. There is no more bitter word of Christ's than that which He uttered concerning the Pharisees of His day: "Ye devour widows' houses." Our Lord, therefore, could not have selected anyone more helpless, or one less likely to succeed in a plea for justice.

People living under the healthy, ennobling teachings of Christianity do not understand this. Widows were made almost the first care of the Christian Church (Acts vi.). It was not the case before, as we learn from many a text of the Old Testament Scriptures. And, besides being helpless, this poor widow of the text had, no doubt, an influential, unscrupulous adversary, who had, probably, bribed this depraved judge to give the case in his favonr, and so permit him to go on with his oppression. On all sides there could be no circumstances more unfavourable for a petition to be answered than those stated in the parable. And yet the parable goes to show that there was success, even under such circumstances.

It seems that "in the East the most corrupt judge might be influenced in three ways—by intimidation, by bribery, and by bothering" (Dr. Bruce). The first two were beyond the reach of the widow, but she was fully capable of using the third. She could clamour and persceute the selfish judge until, through very selfishness, he would grant her her request. Just like the selfish neighbour in the parable, recorded in chapter xi.. who, being very comfortably tucked up in bed, for very comfort's sake refused to rise to give his friend three loaves, but, by his continuing to knock and worry, in the end, for very comfort's sake, he was glad to rise and give him as many as he needed. In the present case the selfishness of the judge yields to the importunity of the helpless widow. He said within himself, "Though I should do it as my duty, that does not matter, as I do not care for justice. I care neither for justice nor humanity. I care solely for my own ease and comfort; yet this widow so torments me that I must, for my own comfort's sake, grant her a verdict in her favour, lest at last she coming *strike* me" (Dr. Bruce). The word which our Authorised Version renders *weary* is literally *strike* (strike under the eye), and is only used on one other remarkable occasion in the New Testament. St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xi. 27, says, "I keep under my body." It means "I beat my body as an antagonist," whenever it attempts to lead me I strike it down, and make it follow. In the case of the judge, however, I do not think that he felt that the widow was likely to come in the end to use physical violence. Still he is really afraid of this widow, and cannot tell what a helpless creature might do who has been goaded to desperation by an utter sense of injustice and wrong. "I must," he says, "grant her her request."

And then the Lord said, by His own authority, "And shall not God avenge His own elect, which cry day and night unto Him, though He bear long with them?" If an unjust and abandoned judge grants a just petition from base motives, when it is often urged, to a defenceless person for whom he cares nothing: how much more shall a just and merciful God, our Heavenly Father, hear the cry and avenge the cause of those whom He loves? "I tell you," says Christ, "that He will avenge them speedily." The avenging here is not to be taken in any modern sense of vengeance. It means vindication—deliverance from the oppressor. And mark, also, that speedily here does not mean soon, but suddenly. That this is the true meaning appears from the context. His people cry unto Him day and night, but He seems to bear a long time with them before He interposes in their cause. Taking all our Lord's teaching on the subject of His Second Coming, He never led His followers to believe that His return would be *soon*, but rather the opposite, although they often misunderstood Him, and thought that the Kingdom of God would soon appear. He did teach that it would be sudden, after a long delay, unexpected, like a thief in the night. And the last words of the parable confirm this idea of delay. "Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith upon the earth?" He here seems to suggest that delay would have a very trying effect on His people's faith, and that the love of many should wax cold. There is, I think, a remarkable commentary on the closing words of this parable in Revelations vi. 9-11.—"And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled." It cannot be said that our Lord endeavoured to gather followers around Him under false pretences. He clearly pointed out to them what they might expect. There is also here, in this parable, an admission of a difficulty in the interpretation of God's providence. Individuals, as well as the Church of God, have felt this difficulty in all ages. Why is it that His children cry, and He appears unmoved? Why does He sit unmoved while wrong seems to overcome the right? These are no imaginary questions. They were put by some of God's most eminent servants. Jeremiah (xii. 1) asks, "Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?" The Psalmist says (Psalm lxxiii.), that his feet had almost gone, and his steps well-nigh slipped when he saw the prosperity of the wicked, and the hard lot of good men. And again (Ps. lxxvii. 7-9): "Will the Lord cast off for ever? and will He be favourable no more? Is His mercy clean gone for ever? doth His promise fail for evermore? Hath God forgotten to be gracious? hath He in anger shut up His tender mercies?"

In these parables our Lord frankly admits these difficulties. He acknowledges that His Coming will be delayed, and during the delay His people's faith will be greatly tried. He gives us no philosophy to explain these difficulties, but He makes two assertions on His own personal authority: one with regard to prayer (xi. 9), "*I* say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you." The other assertion, with regard to the vindication of His people is contained in the text, "I say unto you, He will avenge them speedily."

On these two assertions God's people may safely rest their faith until the day dawn and the shadows flee away. Moreover, also, Christ has taught us that God is our Father, and has revealed to us the Father's heart. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." We cannot believe that He will deal worse with us than an earthly parent. And until He comes there shines across all the darkness of His providential dealings, and all the weariness of waiting, the bright beams of His love, in the gift of His Son. "God so loved the world, that He gave His only Son," makes me trust Him to guide me, although I cannot always see the way He leads me.

But may we not answer the question "Why doth the Lord delay His Coming?" by asking another, Why do we delay to perform His commission and His work? On one occasion, you remember (Mark xiii.), speaking on the subject of His Second Coming, He said "The Gospel must first be preached among all nations." And ere He left the world His commission to His Church was, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." How has the Church fulfilled her Lord's commission? Nobly, thank God, in the first ages. But since that time, until within the last hundred years, the history of missionary enterprise is very sad indeed. The Church practically forgot her Master's commission. A missionary spirit has been once more revived, and the Church is beginning to realise her duty. But if she desires to have her Master's charge fulfilled when He appears, this spirit must be increased a hundred-fold. I do not think I am speaking too strongly when I say that a missionary spirit may be safely taken as the standard of spiritual life. Measured by this, I am afraid that many of us feel that we come very far short. I trust that in the future this may not be so, and that we shall each try and contribute to fulfil our Master's work by our money and our prayers, so that when we pray "Thy kingdom come," it may appear that we really mean what we say.

◆

SUNDAY SCHOLARS AND PEACE.—Mr. Sparke Evans, of Avonside Tannery, Bristol, writes:—"I lately visited the Black Forest, a land of pine trees 180 miles long and about 40 miles broad, interspersed with clearings near the towns and villages, and with pleasant farms, where the water can be turned along the hill sides, and the land thus made more valuable by irrigation. Frequently, in our rambles, we met with the German children attending the cows in the clearings, or gathering the dry wood from the forests; sturdy boys and pleasant-looking girls, the latter always without bonnets, but with nicely braided hair. To make the German tracts more presentable, we gave with them prettily coloured English cards, and from the way they were received, it was evident they seldom had similar pictures offered them, for immediately the children stretched out their small hands for a shake to express hearty thanks. The texts on the cards were in English, and I often wished I could have had a pretty illustration on one side, with a short Sunday School address on the other. (Perhaps some of your readers will take the hint now so many persons travel.) All Germany is a war camp; every able-bodied man is ready, when the telegram calls him, to leave his home, shut his shop, sell his business, and hasten to the frontier. Even the little boys trudge to school with their books in a knapsack, and occasionally on a Sunday afternoon parade through the village street with fifes and drums, and go through their gymnastic exercises in public. Whilst on the other side, French cannon sweep every available yard of ground between Belgium and Switzerland, only through which the Germans can enter France. Some of the best Prussian troops are now in Strasbourg, fourteen battalions of infantry, besides artillery and cavalry, and both countries are being dragged down by the immense cost of the armed peace. Even in England, during the last thirty-three years, we have spent upon our war system 200 millions of pounds. It is indeed time that the calm voice of the arbitrator should be heard instead of the thunder of the cannon. May the extension of Sunday Schools on the Continent carry with them the blessings of peace to aid this longed-for result." Mr. R. R. Wheeler, of Clifton, also writes: "Cannot the friends of the Gospel, in each locality, inaugurate juvenile Peace Classes, by enlisting the co-operation of the Superintendents of our Sunday Schools after the manner of the 'Bands of Hope," the force and good of which is manifest? If Peace principles are to gain ground, it is to the young we must look; and I should rejoice to see some such class started in all our schools. The Churches have lost much by overlooking the importance of the young as factors in future evangelistic work."

ON Sunday Archdeacon Denison completed his eighty-second year.

RUPTURE CURED!

IMPORTANT INVENTION.

MR. C. B. HARNESS, the renowned Inventor of Electropathic Belts and other Curative Electrical Appliances, has lately introduced a **new Washable, Everlasting** Truss, known as

HARNESS' XYLONITE TRUSS

A NEW TRUSS. Guaranteed to **last a lifetime.** All who suffer from **Rupture** should wear **Harness' Xylonite TRUSS.** It has a beautifully smooth flesh-coloured surface, of a washable and durable material; gives complete comfort and support without irritation; is cheap; and weighs only a few ounces.

Pamphlet and Advice **FREE OF CHARGE** on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ld.**

52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.

Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1887.

ELASTICITY OF WORSHIP.

THIS subject has often been discussed at various assemblies of Church people, and would have seemed to have become completely thread-bare; but the Committee of the Church Congress evidently thought otherwise, with the result that so far from being worn out, there is still a great deal to be said in favour of the subject.

The paper of the venerable Archdeacon Watkins was especially valuable, because he testified to the results of such elasticity—within lawful limits, which had been carried out by him in a parish in the City of Newcastle-on-Tyne. The circumstances were simply these. The large parish of All Saints, Newcastle, contained a population of some 10,000 or more; the vicar was an aged man, and unable to do much. The Archdeacon took the position of curate-in-charge, at a nominal salary of five shillings a year, and, with the help of another curate, began to work. It was arranged to have the ordinary morning and evening services at 11 and 3 or 4 o'clock. And in the evening, instead of the usual service, a form of service was drawn up, consisting of prayers, hymns, versicles, responses, creed, &c., all of which were printed on a slip of paper and distributed within the building; the result was that the church was crowded with immense congregations. There was nothing illegal in all this, and we believe that if the same plan were adopted in many other large parishes the result would be eminently satisfactory. The fact remains, that the services of our Book of Common Prayer, beautiful and sublime as they are, are intended for educated Christian people, but if we wish to regain our hold upon the lapsed masses, we must devise some services—short, hearty, and responsive, which will suit all classes, and all sorts and conditions of men. That the services of the Church are intended for educated people, we need only refer to the trouble and perplexity noticeable among the poor in many a congregation when any other than the ordinary services are used; as, for instance, the continuous turning over the leaves of the Prayer-book, to find, say, on Christmas Day, the proper psalms, the Athanasian Creed, or on Easter Day the Easter anthems, which are used instead of the *Venite*. And in many a congregation of poor people we may see them standing without book, giving up as completely hopeless any attempt at finding the proper places in the Prayer-book. A great deal may be done by explaining the services, and showing where to look for them; but still the fact remains that to many it is a sealed book. We have found that in order to meet the needs of the present day, mission rooms are a necessity, and must be provided. Why then should we not go a step further, and give true elasticity of worship, for those who attend these places? It is utterly useless to expect a congregation, gathered out of the slums of our large cities, or the rough miners and iron-workers, to enter into a service with the same ease and comfort as will be found in an educated congregation at the West End, or at some fashionable suburban church. There is, after all, a great deal of truth in the old excuse, that to find the places in the Prayer-book is like a game of hide-and-seek. And in many places dissent has gained ground, in consequence of the apathy or inability of churchmen to grapple with the problem and to solve it.

We see no reason whatever why services, such as those used by Archdeacon Watkins, should not be used in any parish, no matter whether town or country. In many country parishes a simple service, held in the church in the evening, or if the church be too far from the great mass of the people (as it is in many places), the service might be held in a school-room or barn, and with a hearty service, and simple, homely sermons, many might be drawn in who had formerly been either listless or indifferent. The missionary work of the Church must not be lost sight of, and so, where it happens that the people will not go to church, we must in a sense take the church to the people. We may possibly be afraid that by giving this elasticity of worship, it may be used by some for the object of introducing elements, which are contrary to the teaching of the Church, either in the direction of Rome on the one side, or of Dissent on the other; but there need be no such fear, because the services thus drawn up *must* be based on the Book of Common Prayer, and as a further guarantee, they should be sanctioned by the Bishop of the Diocese. With this authority and with these safeguards, there need be no fear of departure from the broad lines of the Church.

The main idea, we take it, is this: that in order to meet the wants of the great masses of the people we need some elasticity of worship, so as not to be bound by the old-fashioned stereotyped forms, but to adapt ourselves and our services to the needs of the present day.

F. D. MAURICE.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE NEWRY CLERICAL CLUB, BY REV. HENRY TAYLOR, M.A., RECTOR OF DRUMBANAGHER.

WHEN a great man appears there is never wanting a sign of his coming. The need of such a man is, indeed, a cloud, in which, as respresenting the Son of Man to men, he shows himself. Such an one we count the subject of our paper—the Rev. Frederick Denison Maurice. A man born into the world, truly, in the fulness of time, when former beliefs needed a fuller light wherein to stand approved; to lose of themselves whatever of them was not of the truth; to find their reward in ministering to the larger view which each age contributes to that which follows; and, in so contributing, fulfils and enriches itself, gaining a juster proportion and fairer relation.

The great charm of the Evangelical movement was in its care for the individual soul. Single conversions were, comparatively, all it concerned itself with, regardless, I say, comparatively, of the larger unit of life to which the individual belongs as member of a Church.

Now, while each step is essential, individual quickening followed by corporate existence, there yet remains the broader view of an universe—of a whole world, if need be—lying in wickedness waiting to respond to the quickening touch of a Divine Hand, and to receive its life-touch through contact with that human body, the Church, divinely prepared to embrace its surroundings, itself modelled on the same lines of separate lives becoming one, in the presence and power of one Divine Spirit, filling and working in each.

The cardinal point of Mr. Maurice's teaching is, that *all things are of Christ.* Original righteousness is his basis of appeal to the human conscience,—not original sin. With him each successive revelation of God is an assertion of some eternal fact, as to His nature and will, and of man's relation to Him, and with man all created being. He, accordingly, sees all creation with Christ as its source and life, and the purpose of each Divine manifestation to be to gather and retain all in Christ.

Maurice's theology is, essentially, a fulfilment, not a mere displacement of pre-existing forms of thought, Calvinism, for instance, is to him a partial, and therefore a self-destructive statement of a truth, viz., that on the Father's will rests the eternal life of any man; but, while supporting Calvinism in its assertion of the Divine Will as the only basis of truth and life, he resents its partial application as a slur on the Divine Spirit of equity, involving the Creator in the charge of self-will and caprice.

From men regarding eternity as an extended period of time instead of a timeless state,—a state not the complement but the antithesis of time—Maurice detects the theological errors which have darkened human ideas as to the facts of eternal life and eternal death; and the metaphysical error which understands the notions of space and time as ideas relative to a finite condition of being, is pressed into the circle of truth—better say, perhaps, is embraced in that circle—in which eternal life is life contrasted with time life, a divine, absolute state of existence, whose character is determined not by its duration but by its spirit and character, and eternal death its denial.

It was this subject of eternal life and eternal death which cost Mr. Maurice his professorate in King's College; his judges finding fault with his interpretation of the meaning of the word *eternal*, which, he contended had no reference to ideas of time, but transcended those ideas; and that the blessing of eternal life, or the woe of eternal death, stood neither the one nor the other in the length of time they embraced, but belonged to their very nature—that of essential life and essential death, regardless of their duration; and, as to the everlastingness of what are termed future torments, he dared to affirm nothing beyond this, that punishment is endless where impenitence is sustained; but that there is no limit to the hope inspired by the love of God, and the power of His love to subdue all things to himself,—the power of original righteousness over subsequent sin.

While asserting the existence of original righteousness, Maurice by no means underestimates the fact of that original evil in men, which is the denial of that righteousness. That there is a personal evil, a spirit of lies and murder at work, from the beginning of man's life, to disturb and darken and deaden his life, is the awful reality from which God is the Eternal Deliverer, as Maurice affirms Him to be; while so just is the deliverance, that a respite from punishment must come because the Father has power to subdue all things unto Himself, not because His creatures' sufferings cause His severity to relent.

Hence it will readily be seen that the *fall* occupies a place of adequate account in Mr. Maurice's teaching, and that from the death it has entailed, in separation from God, we must find redemption in the sacrifice of the second Adam. All the same, however, he contends that men come originally from Christ, and that it is the glory of the incarnation to affirm, restore, and establish our divine standing in Him. That it is, in fact, the message of the Gospel to proclaim their Divine not their fallen state to men, as the true account of themselves, while we name the Name of Father over them — a lost and forgotten name it may be—but still theirs, unalterable and inalienable, into whose life they may return by the redemptive grace of Christ's death.

Accordingly, Revelation is an unveiling of *what is*, and the several ministers of revelation are understood, chiefly and primarily, as going to assert existing facts rather than as going to create those facts. Thus, sacraments are assertions of eternal verities rather than instruments in effecting them. For instance, baptism is a formal presentation of an existing reality, and by it a statement is given of *what is.* Man is thus declared to be what he is, not what he has been regarded as being, and, because he is essentially and originally God's child, he is sealed with the sign of His real rank, the moral effect of the revelation being to reinstate him in his lawful and proper position.

All this is involved in the nature and character of God—God being love. Mr. Maurice understands it to be His property to assert His love, and everywhere to manifest His love, in mercy and in judgment, the mercy and judgment of righting men eternally, of asserting His fatherhood over them. And so truly did he enter into the mind of the Apostle, who has bequeathed to men the words of life "God is Love," that one exclaimed as he listened to him, "it is St. John expounding St. John."

It was natural that with so lofty a conception of man's origin, and a hope amounting to assurance as to his destiny,—that Mr. Maurice should have been felt as a power in questions of social reform. Here, however, he was eminently conservative; for, believing as he did in the divine origin of God's creatures, he felt that in their orders and estates the will of their Father was being expressed, and that so far from social improvement resting on the dead level principle that "all men are equal," it was only to be found in preserving and so fulfilling their various orders and estates. Here, however, the champions of privilege had little to expect from him, and the co-operative scheme was his grand attempt to shelter the weak from the oppression of the strong. As was natural, therefore, such a friend of men found little favour with those who counted the kingdom of Heaven or of earth as the monopoly of a few, but so far from compassing the ends he desired by warring against any class, he would have saved every class from the certain destruction he saw awaited a refusal to obey those laws of God's kingdom, which makes brotherhood on the basis of God's Fatherhood in Christ the only sure foundation of life and health.

A brief summary of Mr. Maurice's life is all that can here be offered in conclusion.

He was the child of Unitarian parents, whose creed he lived to fulfil in whatever excellence it witnessed to, as to the universal Fatherhood of God. With the other members of the family Frederick Maurice broke from his childhood's religious teaching, and lived to affirm the Catholic belief in God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,—the name of all embracing charity as the truth of all the ages.

Politically he became identified with the Chartists, but those who understood him knew that he interested himself in their aspirations with the sole aim of guiding them into channels of Christian sobriety and charity.

His connection with the Tractarians arose from an apparent agreement with their leaders, owing to his conservative regard for the Prayer Book and historic belief, but he was renounced by Dr. Pusey and his adherents, when the differences between them were revealed in Mr. Maurice's own tract on baptism.

His severance from King's College, we have seen, was occasioned by the adverse view as to the meaning of the word *eternal* entertained by the Principal of the College, Dr. Jelf, and later on, he was with difficulty, and only when the cause of truth would have seemed to be imperilled by his doing so, induced to forego the resignation of his benefice when the case of Bishop Colenso was before the public. His connection with the Bishop is characteristic of the loftiness of his justice and generosity. Grateful to one who had stood by him when many denounced him, he grieved bitterly to part from his friend, when Colenso's treatment of Old Testament history forced them asunder.

To his mother Mr. Maurice owed his earliest lessons in the life-long maxim of his heart, viz., *Christ in every man*, and to this principle, as to one clear harp he set in diverse tones the voice of prophecy, of which, need we hesitate to say, he was the master and minstrel to our age.

Meek and lowly in heart, like his Head and Archetype, Maurice resembled the Master in the fearlessness, faithfulness, and strength which he drew from Him. Great in mental strength and mental perception,—great in moral earnestness and purpose, he was greatest of all in his humility, in his willingness to serve, to be least, to be lowest. Great in freedom he had the freedom of his Lord, who taught his servant, and taught him, as he loved to testify for the sake of others, that all he was, he was in the common life of men,—the life of God in Christ.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

SIR,—I was much divided in my own mind as to whether or not Mr. Walker's singular letter on my sermon, "The Intermediate State," was worthy of attention. His letter evinces a want of philosophic and theologic knowledge, and an utter absence of reverence, good temper, and logical sequence. He begins by instituting a comparison between two subjects—"miracles" and "the intermediate state" of the soul—which admit of no comparison. He is unphilosophic, not considering that the whole surface of the earth is the grave of mankind; for it has been computed that if the bodies of all mankind who died since creation's dawn were laid side by side upon the globe they would form a compact mass six feet deep. Consequently the whole superficial area of the earth may, in reason, be considered one grave, and the dust of mankind to rest as really as anything can be said to do so in this world, where nothing is stable but change.

Mr. Walker is theologically wrong, because my interpretation of "Οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ" (2 Cor. xii. 2), is identical with that of Alford, Bloomfield, and other commentators upon the Greek Testament. Will Mr. Walker have the presumption to set up his single opinion against the weight of authority which I have cited? The following is a quotation from Bloomfield's note on "Οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ": "The best commentators are agreed that this expression signifies a disciple or servant of Christ (as supra, v. 17); the Apostle thus speaking of himself in the third person, through modesty, as St. John, in his Gospel, xviii. 15, xix. 35. That the Apostle here means *himself* appears from vv. 6, 7." Where is Mr. Walker's logic? It does not affect my position a whit whether St. Paul or another "was caught up into Paradise"; it is quite sufficient for the soundness of my argument that Holy Writ declares the visit to Paradise, by some God-favoured mortal, to have been a *fact*. This gentleman knows nothing about St. Paul, when he declares him to have been "not a dealer in hyperbole." Again, Mr. Walker ought to learn to think correctly before he ventures to write dogmatically. He talks about theories being "weighed in the balances of a rare logical brain." I have heard of a well-balanced mind before now, but balances weighing in the brain is a startlingly original discovery. Really some one of our many medical periodicals ought to call the attention of the Faculty to Mr. John A. Walker's new and unique physiological discovery of balances actually found weighing in the brain. If reverence for the departed does not hallow this person's nature; good taste at least might suggest to his mind that it is not decent to speak of the dust of the dead as helping "to stop a bunghole, or invigorate a cabbage," etc., etc. In short, Mr. John A. Walker's letter is a fair sample of Hibernian froth,—of that plague of violent language (mistaken for vigour), from which we are suffering so much, at present, in Ireland.

CHARLES RICHARD PANTER,
Clerk, M.A., LL.D.
Chaplain-in-Charge Swift's Alley Church, Dublin.

◆

THE WELSH CHURCH DISESTABLISHMENT.

SIR,—I have read with admiration your leading article, "Poor Little Wales." You have shown its antiquity, and that it is monstrous to call it a Church alien from Wales. All that can be said against it is, that the people have forsaken it; on what grounds, it is now useless to inquire. Of course language was a great cause. But as Mr. Gladstone was supported by the English High Church party and papers, on the same grounds, in his plunder of the Irish Church, it will be necessary to state with shame that the grounds put forward for our plunder, were false, or else wholly insufficient.

The Welsh Sees, as you say, were founded in the 6th century. Well, St. Patrick organised us in the 5th. The Welsh Church was not set up by England. Neither was ours by Elizabeth, though the romancing G. O. Man and the English Church papers said it was. The G. O. Man will, I dare say, pretend, as he did about ours, that the Welsh Church was set up by England to convert the natives; and that, as it neglected its duty, as he falsely said of us, that it, or rather God, should justly be robbed.

Of course, if England neglected the use of the Welsh language, as she forbade the use of the Irish, she is therein to blame. Again, if she filled the Welsh sees and best preferments, as she did ours, with men, held unfit for England, she is to blame. But in those cases neither Wales nor Ireland are to blame: it is monstrous to punish for the wrong those who suffered, rather than those who inflicted that wrong. Churchmen and Church papers may now cry out about sacrilegious plunder. But they encouraged and defended Mr. Gladstone in it. They may say that it is a shame to pretend that the Welsh Church is of new or foreign erection. But they falsely pretended the same as to us. It is vain for them to say that for loss of people the Welsh Church is not to blame, for they laid the very same loss of people on us.

Like the woman in the Proverbs, the English Church may "wipe her mouth," but she cannot say, "I have done no wickedness." Let her acknowledge all her falsehood and treachery against her sister of the Irish Church; let her confess and humble herself in the dust. Thus alone can she escape so that iniquity shall not be her ruin. Let her expect no mercy from the plunderer, who had no mercy on God or us. He will rob her this moment of every penny, every building, every acre she has, if he can by that means bribe the tithe-payers to back him up in his bargain with the Home Rulers, that if he will help them to ruin England, they will help him back again into office. His allies may be mighty. Love of greed can do much. In this struggle God must be your help. But He will never hear you, till you repent, and prove your repentance by confessing your sins against God and us.

INQUIRENS.

◆

BURIAL REFORM ASSOCIATION.—The ninth annual meeting of the Church of England Burial Reform Association was held on Monday afternoon, the 12th inst., in the Chapter-room, St. Paul's Churchyard, under the presidency of the Bishop Suffragan of Bedford. Letters expressing sympathy with the objects of the association, and apologising for non-attendance, were announced from the Earl of Aberdeen, Earl Fortescue, Viscount Sidmouth, the Earl of Essex, the Bishop of Dover, the Bishop of Truro, Canon Liddon, Sir. A. Borthwick, M.P., Mr. F. S. Powell, M.P., Mr. S. Gedge, M.P., the Rev. Dr. Abbott, and many others. A statement of the work done during the past year and the annual financial statement having been read by the Rev. F. Lawrence, Hon. Sec., the Bishop of Bedford moved: "That it is desirable to promote a fuller appreciation of the idea of Christian burial, and thus deepen the faith in the continuity of life after death." He said that he could not help noting the wonderful improvement that had taken place upon the gloomy and costly old funeral customs in this country, though he felt bound to say that undue extravagance in the matter of floral decoration had been introduced. The reform which the society advocated was especially necessary in the interests of their poorer fellow-countrymen, who too often incurred needless expense from the mistaken idea that to spend a large sum of money was a mark of respect to those whom they had loved. If they could show them by example that they thought simplicity a better mode, and that these funeral expenses were worse than unmeaning, they would confer a great boon upon those who could ill afford the expenditure which they thought was necessary lest they should be supposed to be lacking in respect to the dead. Adverting to the desirability of introducing wheeled biers in rural parishes, he said that he had presented one to his own country parish, and had recently set the example of simplicity by having it used in the case of his own sad loss.—The Rev. E. White, ex-chairman of the Congregational Union, seconded the resolution, and suggested that the Archbishop of Canterbury should appoint a Sunday on which this matter of funeral reform should be urged upon their congregations by the parochial clergy throughout the country. If that were done he felt satisfied that Nonconformist communities would heartily join in observing the same day.—The resolution was unanimously adopted, and, on the motion of Canon Elwin, seconded by Prebendary Billing, it was resolved: "That it is desirable that the occasion of a death should be regarded as a special opportunity for showing forth practical Christian sympathy, and for uniting to promote economy and simplicity, thus rendering the funeral as inexpensive as possible to the bereaved."—The Rev. Dr. F. G. Lee and the Rev. Newman Hall spoke in support of the resolution.—Dr. Danford Thomas next moved, and Dr. Septimus Gibbon seconded, "That it is desirable to encourage 'earth to earth' burial, as being more respectful to the dead and more conducive to the conservation of the public health than the prevalent mode of burial in crowded graves and vaults." Dr. Thomas, whose office of coroner brings him into direct contact with the dead, urged the importance on sanitary grounds of speedy interment of one body in one grave. Dr. Gibbon endorsed Dr. Thomas's sound sanitary injunctions, and thought that they would be more extensively put into practice if the clergy made a more definite and marked distinction between the natural and the resurrection body, following the teaching of Shakespeare, who says :—

> Ay, but to die, and go we know not where ;
> To lie in cold obstruction, and to rot ;
> This sensible warm motion to become
> A kneaded clod ; and the delighted spirit
> To bathe in fiery floods, or to reside
> In thrilling regions of thick-ribbed ice.

If persons realised, more vividly than they now do, that these two bodies exist after death, they would pay less costly honours to the one about to become "a kneaded clod." Physiology, as well as faith, proved the formation of a spiritual body which would exist after death, and he thought that it was to this body—the character of the deceased—that reverence and respect should be paid. Inasmuch as practice was more convincing than preaching, Dr. Gibbon suggested that the Association should form themselves into a League or Guild, individually pledged to carry out the "earth to earth" system of burial. The resolution was carried.—The following resolutions, moved and seconded respectively by Dr. Campbell and the Rev. W. Bentram, and the Rev. Prebendary Harry Jones and Dr. Hubbard, were also adopted : "That it is desirable to recognise that there is no common-law right to a perpetual ownership of the soil for the buried, and that incumbents can decline to sanction the construction of bricked graves and vaults in the churchyards of which they are trustees ;" and "That it is desirable that ministers of religion, medical men, and especially medical officers of health, solicitors, executors, and trustees, members of burial boards, and sanitary authorities, officers of friendly societies, guardians of the poor, and others interested in the encouragement of temperance and thrift should give the society their moral and practical support." — Mr. F. W. Sabin moved a resolution strongly urging upon the Association the imperative necessity of bringing under the immediate attention of the authorities the disgraceful condition of the London cemeteries, with a view to the removal of a serious danger, and a great scandal to the community. In corroboration of some remarks which Dr. Danford Thomas had made with regard to the state of some of the London cemeteries, he stated that in what were called common interments at Ilford Cemetery, a trench about 60 feet long by 16 feet deep was dug, and tiers of 20 or more coffins placed in it, with only three inches of soil intervening, until the whole trench was filled with a mass of about 300 bodies.—Mr. Diprose seconded the resolution, which was carried, and the proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the Bishop of Bedford for presiding.

DR. C. V. STANFORD, the organist of Trinity College, Cambridge, has been elected to the professorship of music. His reputation is so wide that it is needless to attempt to chronicle all the works on which his fame rests. His most ambitious efforts have been the three operas, "The Veiled Prophet," "The Canterbury Pilgrims," and "Savonarola." Of these only the second has been fairly presented to an English audience, though the others have been well received in Germany. "The Three Holy Children" and "The Revenge" are probably the works by which he is best known in England ; but in Cambridge we are also grateful to him for his unwearied efforts in connection with the University Musical Society, and also for the part he has taken in the revival of Greek Plays.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bottome, Rev. William McDonald, M.A., Vicar of Over Stowey, Bridgewater.
Burton, Rev. Clarke Watkins, M.A., Rector of Cliburn, Penrith ; Rural Dean of Lowther.
Cooper, Rev. Frederick Wilson, B.A., Missioner of the Society of St. Andrew and Public Preacher in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Dalby, Rev. James B., Vicar of Madehurst, Arundel.
Davies, Rev. R. O., M.A. (Oxon), L.Mus., F.R.S.E., &c., Rector of Kettleburgh, Suffolk.
Denison, Rev. William, Incumbent of Leeming, Yorkshire.
Dunbar, Rev. Charles Gordon Cumming, Licensed to Officiate in Little Heath Chapel, Ilford.
Firth, Rev. G. W. A., Minor Canon of Ely ; Minor Canon and Sacrist of Durham Cathedral.
Forbes, Rev. J. D. B, Curate of Holy Trinity, Poulton-le-Sands ; Incumbent of the Wych Memorial Church, Hartfield, Tunbridge Wells.
Fulford, Rev. Frederick John, formerly Curate of Ecclesall, Sheffield ; Vice-Principal of Gloucester Theological College.
Hewetson, Rev. Joseph, Curate of St. Martin-in-the-Fields ; Vice-Principal of Wycliffe Hall and Curate of St. Peter-le-Bailey, Oxford.
Hole, Rev. Canon Samuel Reynolds, M.A., Vicar of Caunton, Newark, and Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury ; Dean of Rochester.
Kyrke, Rev. R., M.A., Curate-in-Charge ; Rector of Croxton, near Ulceby, Lincolnshire.
Lambert, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Prebendary of Pratum Minor in Hereford Cathedral.
Mills, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of Derwent, Woodlands, Derbyshire ; Rector of Siddington, Gloucestershire.
Obbard Rev. A. N., Rector of All Saints', Southampton ; Surrogate for Hampshire and Isle of Wight.
Richards, Rev. David, Curate of Loughor ; Vicar of Llandissilio Gogo, Cardiganshire.
Skeen, Rev. Samuel Slinn, Curate of Hardingham ; Vicar of Myton-on-Swale, Yorkshire.
Sketchley, Rev. Horatio Powis, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Smart, Rev. William H., Mus.B., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of London.
Thompson, Rev. James Denton, M.A., Clerical Superintendent of the Liverpool Scripture-Readers Society ; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Tindall, Rev. Peter Francis, M.A., Vicar of Sandgate ; Vicar of Ashford, Kent.
Ward, Rev. Frederick William Orde, M.A., Rector of Nuffield, Oxon.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Broad, Rev. John S., M.A., Vicar of Pentney and West Bilney, Norfolk, at Pentney Vicarage, on the 7th inst., aged 78.
Graham, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of Bexley Heath, Kent, at the Vicarage, on the 9th inst., aged 43.
Master, Rev. Augustus Chester, Vicar of Preston All Saints', Cirencester, on the 10th inst., aged 64.
Palmer, Rev. Thomas, J.P., Rector of Trimley St. Martin, Suffolk, on the 7th inst.
Perkins, Rev. George, M.A., of Haute Ville, Guernsey, and formerly of Manchester, on the 9th inst.
Roberts, Rev. Edward, M.A., for twenty-four years Rector and Preacher of Bunbury, Cheshire, at Bournemouth, on the 5th inst., aged 72.
Smith, Rev. Urban, M.A., at Stony Middleton, on the 9th inst., aged 80.
Thompson, Rev. Henry Bell, B.A., at Tatworth Vicarage, Chard, on the 5th inst., aged 60.
Thompson, Rev. Henry John, M.A., Vicar of Dodford and Rural Dean of Weedon, at Dodford Vicarage, Weedon, on the 12th inst., aged 57.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE SPIRITUAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE BODY.

By the Very Rev. J. J. STEWART-PEROWNE, D.D., Dean of Peterborough.

Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford, on Sunday, November 6th, 1887.

> "For our citizenship is in heaven: from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself."—(*R. V.*) Phil. iii. 20, 21.

IN this striking passage St. Paul throws a vivid light both upon our future destiny and upon its relation to our present existence. You will not be surprised that I should have read it as it stands in the Revised Version. There is hardly any passage in the New Testament in which the changes made have been so conspicuously an advantage. No scholar will question the accuracy of the new rendering; no English reader but must be thankful to have its true sense put before him.

There are several points here which deserve our careful consideration. First, it is made clear that our present existence is not circumscribed and limited by what we can see, and hear, and touch, and taste, but that there is an unseen universe to which we belong—our citizenship or our commonwealth is in heaven. Next, we are reminded that there is a correlation between the earthly and the heavenly, and that there is an essential continuity between the present life and the future, but that the visible order of things shall pass away in order to make room for the invisible. A change shall pass upon the human body which is now adapted to its earthly environment in order to fit it for the new sphere into which it is to enter. Further, we are told that this shall finally be accomplished, not by any process of natural evolution, but by the putting forth of a Divine power. The Lord from heaven shall accomplish it according to the mighty working whereby He is able to subject all things to Himself. And, lastly, this is to be a part of the great consummation when the Saviour for whom we look shall return again from heaven to earth.

The Apostle, first of all, reminds his Philippian converts of the high destiny of the Christian, even in this present state of things, amid all the imperfection and the transitoriness which surround him, and from which he himself cannot escape. His citizenship is in heaven. It is there already; it is there an ascertained fact; it is there a present possession. We enjoy its rights, we are governed by its laws; we may exercise its privileges now. "Heaven lies about us," not only in our infancy, but in a deeper and larger sense in our ripe manhood, if we be Christ's. This is the great ideal of the Christian life. It is (not it shall be) a life in heaven. "Ye are come," not ye shall come, but ye are come, "to Mount Zion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem; to an innumerable company of angels, and to the Church of the first-born whose names are written in heaven." Ye are "raised together with Christ." This is the prerogative of faith. Two worlds are ours now. All round about us, touching us on every side, demanding our allegiance is a kingdom not of this world. We are free-born members of that Divine community And yet our emancipation is not complete. And yet we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; we wait and look for that which is to come. We are redeemed, we are saved, we are glorified, changed from glory to glory, as by the Lord the Spirit, and yet there is a future redemption, a future salvation, a future glory. There is a redemption not yet accomplished, to wit, the redemption of our body. The body so wonderfully and fearfully made, the body which is such a marvellously intricate and delicately-constructed machine, and which is so strikingly adapted to be the instrument of the spirit's will, is nevertheless a perishing body. Frailty is written upon it. From birth to death it is perishing, it is transitory, as the created system of which it is a part, and for which it was fashioned is transitory. And therefore the Apostle, speaking of heaven as our true abode, adds immediately: "From whence also we look for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation."

"Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation." The improvement in the rendering is manifest. The Authorised Version says, "Our vile body." The body is not "vile." The adjective may have had a sense less disparaging when our version was made, but as we read it now, it conveys a wrong impression. Such a phrase might have suited the Manichean heretics, who held that matter was in its nature evil, and that it was the work of a malignant and evil deity; or it might have been found in the mouth of a Stoic or a Platonist, who, like Plotinus, thanked God that he was not tied to an immortal body; but it cannot harmonise with the Christian belief. It is not too much to say that the whole witness of Christian faith is directly at variance with such an expression. The body is the masterpiece of God's material creation. The Son of God took to Himself a human body in the Virgin's womb, and for ever united it to Himself as an essential part of His Divine Personality. St. Paul, therefore, we may be sure, would not encourage any Stoic contempt, any Manichean hatred of the body. No man ever spoke more strongly of the sanctity of the body, of the honour and reverence due to it, of the high destiny that awaits it, of the duty of keeping it free from all spot of defilement. St. Paul could not have called that body "vile" of which he writes, "What, know ye not that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost, which is in you?" St. Paul could not have called that body "vile" of which he asks, "Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?" St. Paul could not have called that body "vile" of which he tells us that it is the instrument wherein we are to glorify God: "Ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body." St. Paul could not have said one word in disparagement of that body for which he prophecies so glorious a future, telling us that it shall take the very form and substantial likeness of the body of our Risen and Ascended Lord. This, my brethren, is emphatically the glory of Christianity, that it puts high honour on the human body as well as on the human spirit; it takes the whole man into its keeping; it invests each part of us with its luminous majesty. It bids us pray that God would preserve body, as well as soul and spirit, blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. I say St. Paul could not speak of the body as "vile;" but he does speak of it as the body of our humiliation, the body of our present low estate as children of fallen parents, the body which is "the inlet of temptation, and the lodging-house of sin," the body which is frail and perishing and transitory, the body which subserves only a temporary purpose, and is destined to a great and marvellous transformation. Christ, when He comes again, shall "change the fashion of it." Mark the accuracy of the expression. The fashion is not permanent; it has its growth, its fluctuation, its decay. All that is fleeting in it is to pass away, in order that a new and permanent body may take its place, "That it may be conformed to the body of His glory."

Surely, brethren, it is a very lofty, a very animating hope, which the Apostle here sets before us, when he tells us that our body shall have a form like that of Christ's body in His glory. Can we imagine what that likeness will be? What do we gather as to the change which passed upon our Lord at His resurrection? He rose with a true human body. To His disciples, who were terrified and affrighted, and supposed they saw a spirit, He said "Handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." It was a true body with which He rose, for He did eat and drink with His disciples. It was a true body, for He carried still on His sacred person the print of the nails and the wound of the spear: those august signs of His passion had not been obliterated. It was a true human body. But it was a body clothed with new powers, a body on which a change had passed. He was the same and yet not the same. He came and went mysteriously. He passed like the wind through closed doors. His disciples knew Him and yet they knew Him not. The awe of His resurrection was upon them. And ever as He drew nearer to the time that He should be taken up, the awe and the mystery deepened. He had eaten with them after He rose; He *gave them to eat*, He did not eat and drink with them now. It would seem as if during those forty days which intervened between His Resurrection and His Ascension a gradual transformation was wrought, by which the spiritual body of the Resurrection was assimilated more and more to its spiritual environment, till at last it put on the fulness of its glory in the Ascension. But even then it was a human body, a body of human speech and human members and action, for it came to pass that as He was parted from them He lifted up His hands upon them and blessed them. Nor does the revelation end here. To Paul He appeared in the blinding glory of a celestial light. To his servant John, in Patmos, it was given to behold, and to portray, so far as language can portray it, the vision of the human form in its heavenly glory. St. John was in the Spirit on that Easter Day. He heard a voice; he turned to see, and being turned he saw seven golden candlesticks, and "in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like the Son of Man clothed with a garment down to the feet, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and His hair were white as wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; and His feet like unto burnished brass, as it had been refined in a furnace, and His voice as the voice of many waters; and he had in his right hand seven stars; and out of his mouth proceeded a sharp two-edged sword, and His countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength." That vision of resplendent glory is the vision of the risen and ascended Son of Man. That is the body of His glory. To that body our bodies shall be like—like with a true resemblance, like with a real, essential conformity. Such great things hath God done for us. For this are we to hope; for nothing less than this are we to look—a likeness to our risen Lord. As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. "We shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as he is."

But it will be said that our Lord's body did not see corruption; how then can His resurrection be an argument for ours? The bodies of the saints who shall be alive at His coming will not see corruption, for they shall be changed as in a moment; how does this assure us that we shall be raised out of our graves, and put on the vesture of immortality? How is it with bodies that have been laid in the grave, and have turned again to their dust? Can this dust live? Who has not longed for an answer to that question in some hour of desolating, heart-breaking, bereavement?

We are looking for the last time on the face of one who has been to us the very life of our life. Those eyes can no more look into ours with answering affection. That voice, which was as music in our ears, is silent. That hand, the grasp of which has thrilled us with tenderness, is still and cold. Is all at an end? "Ashes to ashes, dust to dust." Can the grave give back the dead? Shall we hear that voice again? Will it soothe and guide and bless us as of old? Will that hand clasp ours again? Shall we see eye to eye? You point me to the Risen Christ for an answer, but my heart says God's Holy One saw no corruption, and he whom I loved is a handful of dust, and mingled with the common clay. How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?

That is an old perplexity. Our modern science may have given it more edge, and more sharpness, but there were philosophers on Mars' Hill who mocked when Paul preached through Jesus the resurrection of the dead, and there were Christians in Corinth who could admit the Resurrection of Christ, and yet deny the Resurrection of man. The immortality of the soul was conceivable, the existence of the disembodied spirit after death, and an abode of bliss for the virtuous and of misery for the wicked, was an accepted article of the popular creed. But that the body which they had seen turn to corruption should ever be re-united to the spirit—this appeared to be nothing short of a fantastic dream, and to many men this seems impossible now. And Christian reasoners have not always dealt wisely with this question. They have sometimes argued that although the body is dissolved into its original dust, yet every particle of that dust, gathered by the hand of God, is placed in his treasure-house, in order that it may form again the resurrection body. And then science steps in and demonstrates triumphantly the impossibility of such a reconstruction. And so it comes to pass that, having taken up for ourselves a position not warranted by Scripture, we find ourselves seriously and unnecessarily embarrassed. May I be pardoned if for a few moments I dwell upon this subject, for it is one on which it is very important that we should think rightly. I am speaking, I know, in the presence of Masters in Theology, in Science, in Philosophy, to whom I shall seem to be uttering only trite and familiar truths. But, perhaps, some of them would be astonished if they knew how firmly rooted in many minds is the doctrine of the resurrection of the material body, and what a real difficulty it is to others that is thus apparently implied in the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. What then are the simple facts regarding our bodies when they die? Many are never laid in the grave at all. Some perish by fire, and their ashes are scattered to the four winds of heaven; some lie in the depths of the sea; some have been devoured by wild beasts, or by their fellow-men in unnatural banquets. Of those that have been laid in the earth the dust has been dispersed and has passed into other bodies. "All the dead become after a short time not only dust but vapour. They enter into other forms, either with or without chemical decomposition, and become the elements of other living creatures, plants, animals, and men." "The dead," it has been truly said, "are the life of the living. We inhale the dead; they flow in our veins; they help to form the texture of our bodies and our brain-cells." The particles of each are become the property of many. You must mutilate one body to reconstitute another; you must mutilate many bodies to reconstitute one, if, in order to reconstitute it, you must bring together all the material particles of which it was composed. I say this is a physical impossibility. I am not limiting the power of God. I am only saying that to suppose Him to do this, is to suppose Him to do what is not supernatural, but what is unnatural. Millions of human bodies would, if this hypothesis were true, lay claim to the very same particles of matter at the resurrection of the last day. Happily, our Christian belief does not pledge us to such an absurdity as this. I shall show presently how St. Paul shatters all assumptions of this kind. But before I do this, let me venture to make one other remark—hardly necessary perhaps in this place—which, I trust, will completely satisfy those who may still feel a difficulty in understanding how a resurrection of the body is possible, unless the material particles of which it is composed, are brought together for the resurrection body. Let us think for a moment of the way in which our bodies grow. Let us ask ourselves what it is that constitutes their identity. Our bodies are not an unchanging mass; they are in a state of perpetual flux. We are constantly taking in fresh matter through the air we breathe, and the food we eat. We are constantly losing in various ways some of the properties which constitute our frame. Bone, tissue, nerves, muscles, all are changing. The comparison of the German thinker, who likens the body to a ripple, around some hidden stone in a stream, is physiologically true. We see day after day the same ripple on the stream, the same wave-form, produced by the same cause, but the drops of water are always changing. Our bodies are but momentary forms. The body of our childhood is not the body of our youth, nor the body of our youth that of our manhood, nor the body of our manhood that of our old age. Every particle has changed, and yet it is the same body; the person to whom it belongs is still the same person. You recognise him by feature and voice and gesture; twenty years hence you would recognise him as you do to-day. If you insist upon it that every particle of matter of which my body is built must be brought together again to form my new resurrection body, then I ask—Which body, during my present life, is my true body? Is it the body of my childhood, or of my youth, or of my old age? The body in which I die is not more truly mine than the body with which I came into the world. Both are mine, both are in some sense the same, and yet they have not a single material particle in common. What possible reason is there then for contending that the body which is laid in the grave, it may be in disease and decrepitude, must be brought together again, particle for particle, at the resurrection, when it is not more essentially a part of myself than my body at any other stage of my existence? Of this, and this only, do I need to be assured, that the principle of identity which governs the formation of the body in this life, shall govern it at the resurrection. In the everflowing torrent of life, as wave after wave passes through our bodily frame, bringing with it growth and variety in the structure, there is some principle, or law, or building force, or specific form, call it what you will, that remains ever the same. The organism is essentially one, despite the modifications of size, or form, of inward constitution. "Why, then, should God lock up in the perishable earth a single particle of dust for our immortal inheritance? It is enough that He has so connected the mortal and the immortal, so created the two kinds of existence in such organic relationship that the natural is the preparation for the spiritual; that the image of the heavenly which we shall bear is the fulfilment of the earthly which we shall lay aside; that in some natural way, according, that is, to the whole nature of things, though beyond our knowledge—for we know now only in part, only the half of the nature of things—the body which shall be, shall conserve and glorify the forces, and individuality, and form of the body which now is. The person shall rise from the dead."

And now I turn to Holy Scripture. Now I ask you to look with me at the language of St. Paul. I say he shatters at a blow the doctrine of the identity of material particles. He tells us in plain words that flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. He warns us that the body which rises is not the body which is laid in the grave. Words cannot be more explicit. It is sown a natural, or rather a psychical body, a body formed for and animated by the ψυχή or soul, it is raised a spiritual body. This is, as he views it, a part of the order of nature, first that which is psychical, afterwards that which is spiritual. When he is asked, How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? he flashes out in impatient remonstrance, "O senseless man, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." Through death comes life. There is a living principle which has fashioned the plant; that living principle survives decay, and by it is fashioned the new plant which springs from the old. With what body do they come? "Thou sowest not that body which shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain: but God giveth it a body *as it hath pleased Him*." Provision is made for the continuity of the life in the midst of death *by the law of God's creation*. I do not say that the spiritual body grows out of the natural or animal body in the same way as the plant grows out of the seed; for the laws of the natural world are not identical with the laws of the spiritual world; though there is a true analogy between them, and we may trace the analogy, and see how the natural law is the interpreter of the spiritual. The dry corn of wheat is cast into the ground, and there springs up, first the green blade, and then the full and bending ear. The acorn drops from the oak, and there arises from it, not another acorn, but first the little germinant shoot, hidden between its two smooth leaves, which grows and grows till it becomes a broadly-spreading tree, so that the fowls of the air lodge in the branches thereof. Or look at that yet more marvellous change, that most vivid and most eloquent of all Nature's parables, when the unsightly, crawling worm is transformed into the gorgeous butterfly. Once that creature could only crawl upon the earth. Then it wove its own chrysalis shroud; then, without any new environment, with the same sun above, with the same earth beneath, and the same food—what is that strange force which begins to weave on a new plan, or to carry out one held in reserve from the first? How comes that gorgeous tropical butterfly, with all its exquisite delicacy of texture, with all its splendid colours, with all its animation of life, with all its power of transporting itself whither it will—how comes it out of the crawling, creeping, unsightly worm? It is the same creature, and yet how different. It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead. If God has so wrought his wonders before our eyes, why say some among us that a resurrection is incredible, or that if there is to be a resurrection, it must be a reconstruction of physical particles? That is not the doctrine of St. Paul, it ought not to be the doctrine of any reasonable man.

But, lastly, how does all this bear on the question of our reverence for the body now? If it is not the same body that is raised, what motive has the Christian to reverence his body, either in life or in death? I answer first, we honour the body that is laid in the grave for its past, not for its future. We honour it because it has been the form which we loved, and the shrine of God. And I answer next, that there is in this life a certain real, though mysterious, connection between the material body and the spiritual body. I believe, and some of the profoundest philosophers of modern times have held the belief, that the force which is weaving the material body is also by some occult and subtle process building up the spiritual body? the one has a certain, definite, though mysterious relation to the other. Have you never seen the spiritual body? I believe it has been seen through the veil and covering of the flesh. "And all that sat in the council steadfastly beholding Him saw His face as it had been the face of an angel?" Was there no revelation there of the spiritual body shining through the earthly envelope? Have you never seen it in one you knew and loved? I am sorry for you if you have not. Have you never seen it in the decay of life? On the emaciated, sunken, and wasted features, have you never seen a glory which is not of this world? It is the glory of the spiritual body shining through the fading envelope which shrouds it, and already anticipating the resurrection. Yes, it is this which makes the resurrection credible. It is this which expresses to us how that which is sown in dishonour is raised in glory, how that which is sown a natural body is raised a spiritual body. We begin to perceive how it is possible, in what sense it is true, that when Christ comes He shall change the fashion of the body of our humiliation, that it may be made like unto the body of His glory.

But if there is this close, essential, vital, real union between the natural body which dies, and the spiritual body which is raised, then how solemn the obligation laid upon us to reverence our bodies, for in some real sense those bodies shall be ours at the resurrection. If Christ has put such honour upon them, how shall we dare to profane them? Shall we pamper them, shall we deck them out with the trappings of vanity, shall we degrade them by sensuality and vicious excess till their very frame is scarred all over with the foul and hideous leprosy of intemperance and lust? God keep us from so awful a profanation of His shrine. "Know ye not that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost?" They are sacred as the holy place of the Most High. They are destined to a glorious transformation. Shall I then suffer the eyes which shall see the King in His beauty to wander after hurtful lusts and forbidden vanities? Shall the mouth which is destined to join in the heavenly hallelujah, utter the ribald jests or indulge in the lewd or foolish talk? Shall the hand which shall hereafter strike the golden lyre in the temple above, clutch the filthy lucre or smite with the fist of wickedness? Shall the feet which are to tread the golden streets and walk in the city of the ransomed, be swift now to unholy pleasure or unrighteous gain? No; let me see to it that I guard the shrine in which God dwells from such desecration. It may decay in its material particles, it may mingle with the common dust, but it has some strange, intimate union with the body that shall rise again. As I treat my material body now, so shall my spiritual body be fashioned. If I make it the ready gate of sin now, it may hereafter quiver through and through with a sensitiveness which the animal body cannot feel, in the consciousness of its degradation and the agony of its suffering. If I honour it now, if I keep it from defilement, if I venerate it as the temple of the Holy Ghost, if I glorify God (who has made it) with my body, then through decay and death it shall pass to its glorious resurrection, no more liable to pain, or weakness, or decay, a spiritual body, radiant with the light of heaven, free to accomplish all that service to God for which it has been trained here. So when I put off this tabernacle, I shall not be unclothed, but clothed upon with my house from heaven; so in the resurrection morn I shall put on my garment of immortality, my new body made like unto the body of Christ's glory, "according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subject all things unto Himself."

"THY KING COMETH UNTO THEE."

By the Rev. J. CARR, LL.D., Vicar of Whitechurch, Dublin.

Sermon Preached in Whitechurch Parish Church, on Sunday Morning, November 27th, 1887.

"Behold, thy King cometh unto thee."—St. Matt. xxi. 5.

We enter this morning into the Church's season of preparation for the great festival of Christmas-day, when we shall be called upon rightly and devoutly to celebrate the mystery of the Incarnation. As Lent is intended to prepare us to keep Good Friday and Easter, so Advent calls on us to tune our hearts with a view to joining in the song of the angels on the feast of the Nativity: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men."

We speak of the Advent of Christ, but in truth there have been many advents of the Lord, as there will be one more in the end of the world, when He comes again to wind up all things, to judge the quick and the dead, to place His enemies under His feet, and reign for ever, as King of kings and Lord of lords. Not to speak of the mysterious pre-advents of Christ—those theophanies or manifestations of His presence which we read of in the Old Testament Scriptures when He appeared as the Angel of the Lord, claiming divine worship, or the Angel of the Covenant, or the Captain of the Lord's Host; all of which appearances were anticipations of a more intimate association with the world when He should assume human flesh in the womb of the Virgin—we may still speak of certain advents of Christ after this event. The Gospel for to-day, for example, suggests one such advent, namely, this coming of Christ to Jerusalem as its King.

But all these advents depended upon the first and fundamental truth of the Incarnation. His birth was the historic coming of Jesus Christ into the world. As Christians we date all history from this epoch-making event. The two letters "A.D.," with figures before or after them, tell their own tale; they are a perpetual witness to the truth of Christmas—a silent testimony to the fact of the Incarnation of God. They mean the year of our Lord; so many years from the Nativity; from the day when Christ lay as an infant in the manger of Bethlehem.

When we speak of the advent of Christ, we mean, primarily and above everything else, His birth; we mean that glorious event, so full of hope for the world, when the Virgin-Mother gave birth to Him who is "Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," and at the same time "bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh." This is so essentially the first advent that, in contrast with it, our Lord's return at the end of the world is always spoken of as His "Second Advent."

Regarding our Lord's birth, then, as His primary advent, which made possible any further manifestations of His Person to men, we can go on to consider other ways in which the New Testament reveals Christ as coming to mankind. For example, shortly after He entered His thirtieth year Jesus came before the world "preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God. He presented Himself to the world as the Divine Teacher with a message from heaven proclaiming the laws of the new kingdom. He came, whether men would hear or whether they would forbear; He came with the words of life and wisdom on His lips crying—"He that hath ears let him hear!" We may say that our Lord came again at His transfiguration, not indeed then to the world at large, but only to a chosen few, to the representatives of His church. He came in His glory, it was a rehearsal of His second advent, when He will come again "with power and great glory."

Passing over for a moment the advent of Christ in triumph to Jerusalem, which is the subject of the Gospel for to-day, we may say that our Lord's appearance after His resurrection from the dead was another advent. Then He came again to men clothed in the marvellous "light that never was on sea or land;" He came a denizen from another world, clad in immortal beauty, with the halo of heaven resting upon Him; He came, going in and out among His disciples, but no longer of their company; He came revealing to them the mysteries of the invisible world—here one moment, gone the next—but still full of human sympathies, tender to Mary, compassionate towards Peter, patient with Thomas; reasoning with them out of the Scriptures, making Himself known to them in the breaking of bread, commissioning them to preach His Gospel, to feed His sheep, and fold His lambs, and promising to be with them even to the end of the world.

Out of these several advents, of which the New Testament speaks to us, the Church has selected one to form the subject of to-day's Gospel—the advent of Christ in all lowliness and humility to Jerusalem. Then, as the Evangelist informs us, was fulfilled an ancient prophecy—"Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold thy King cometh unto thee, meek and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass."

Let us consider some points of interest, and it may be of instruction in this narrative. And, first of all, the Person spoken of: "Behold thy King cometh unto thee!" It was an event to be duly taken notice of, the first and last advent of Christ to Jerusalem, as its King, for indeed He was their King. More than thirty years before, the wise men had come from the East to Jerusalem with this question on their lips, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews, for we have seen his star in the East, and are come to worship Him?" It would not have done for our Lord to go out of the world without making good this claim to be a King. Once and once only He claimed the honour, and allowed Himself a royal triumph. The Jews were to have the opportunity of accepting or rejecting Him as their long promised Messiah, the Prince of Peace!

But Christ is evermore coming to men as their King. It is as true of us as of the Jews of old that our King cometh unto us. He is not our Saviour unless He is also our King. As God He is our King, and claims us as His subjects. As man He is also our King, through His sufferings for us on the Cross, when He purchased us with His precious blood. "The Lord reigneth from the tree," as it is said. By virtue of His mediatorial office Christ is at once our "Prophet, Priest, and King." He claims our hearts, our obedience, our service. He is nothing to us if He be not our King. But Christ is only a King where He reigns; and unless He rules in our hearts, unless His laws are every thing to us, unless He is supreme over our thoughts and affections, He cannot be said to be our King. We do not own Him as such, we virtually say with His enemies of old—"We will not have this man to reign over us." Every recurring advent may be regarded as a season when once more our Lord comes to men to make good this claim to be their King. Well, then, for you and me, for each one of us, it is true on this Advent Sunday—"Thy King cometh unto thee." Once more He stands before us to claim our allegiance, once more He asks us to accept Him, once more He pleads His Kingly authority, and says: "Open ye the gates, that the righteous Lord may enter in." "Behold I stand at the door and knock!"

But, secondly, how does He come to us? Does He come as a proud imperious Sovereign? Does He come with harsh and cruel edicts? Does He come making unreasonable demands upon our obedience? No, but He comes, as He came of old, to the city of Zion, "Meek and lowly, and having salvation." He comes not with a yoke of iron in His hands, to gall and hurt our necks withal; but He comes to us with a yoke of love, of tenderness, of compassion. "Take my yoke upon you," He says, "and learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly of heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls: for my yoke is easy and my burden is light." He who came to Jerusalem, claiming to be a King, came there to suffer and to die for men. It is through suffering and death that our Lord inaugurated His Kingly power; and He reigns now in the hearts of His people on the basis of self-sacrifice. He does not claim to be our King without having first been our Saviour; and so says the hymn—

> "Ride on, ride on, in Majesty,
> In lowly pomp ride on to die,
> Bow Thy meek head to mortal pain;
> Then take, O God, Thy power and reign!"

Our Lord at this time was coming into Jerusalem to win back the kingdom that sin had forfeited. The kingdom was lost through pride, it would be won back through humility. "Though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich." In His entry on this occasion into Jerusalem, "meek and riding on the foal of an ass," He manifested that "great humility," of which the Collect for to-day speaks as the characteristic of His first advent.

And have we not a special lesson here? If we have any great work to do in the world, we will not compass it through pride and boasting. Those who are in earnest about any great work, will seek to accomplish it quietly, unostentatiously, and perseveringly. The streams that work the great machinery of the world, have their rise in quiet places amid the solitary hills; and so, true and earnest endeavour is born of simple and quiet resolution, made in the strength of God's Holy Spirit. Our Lord was about to accomplish the mighty work of the world's redemption from sin and death; and this was the way He went about it.

"Thy King cometh unto thee." "Now in the time of this mortal life," He comes to us once again "in great humility." Before long in God's providence we shall kneel at the manger of Bethlehem and contemplate the Divine Babe. How shall we best get ready to go forth and meet Him? We must by true repentance cast off the works of darkness and put upon us the armour of light; we must humble ourselves before the advent of our King; we must as did the disciples of old, take with us branches of palm—the symbols of victory over our sins; we must restrain the evil passions of pride and anger by the thought of the gentleness and kindness of the coming Saviour; we must be clothed with humility and so prepare for the joys of Christmas, we must cultivate a loving spirit and hold forth the olive branch of forgiveness to those who may have offended us. Christ comes to us with pardon and peace, and we must reciprocate His gifts. "Freely ye have received, freely give." This it is that will make for us a happy and a blessed Christmas, and enable us rightly to celebrate the advent of the Prince of Peace. "Thy King cometh unto thee." May each of us have grace to say, Even so, come Lord Jesus; come and take possession of my heart and make it the throne for Thy presence!

ERRATUM.—In the last line of first column of p. 297 of our last number, "the metaphysical error which" was inadvertently printed instead of "the metaphysician who."

ON Thursday, the 15th inst., a new window, by Messrs. Winfield, was unveiled in the Priory Church, Malvern, the gift of Mr. James Atkins, of Hampton, Malvern. The lower part contains small medallions in commemoration of Her Majesty's Accession, Coronation, and Jubilee. The bells of the church and the clock-chimes have also been restored, and three new bells have been given by two parishioners.

THE services at Exeter College Chapel, Oxford, have lately been much improved, and the choir now consists of fourteen boys and the same number of men, the latter including six tenors, one of the features on Sunday being the Choral Litany, unaccompanied. So many people have flocked to the chapel that the authorities have been compelled to close it to the general public, and tickets of admission are issued to a limited number, there being only a few stalls to spare after the members are accommodated. Sunday, the 4th inst., being the first under the new regulations, there was a crowded congregation in the afternoon, when the anthem was Steggall's "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth." The improvement in the service is mainly due to the organist, Mr. F. C. Woods, who is also a very efficient choirmaster, and the Rev. J. M. Macdonald, the precentor and acting chaplain. Choral services are held only on Sundays, Saints' days, and Vigils.

THE Rev. Thomas Lowe, Vicar of Willingdon, died somewhat unexpectedly on Monday, although he had been failing for some time past. Canon Lowe was the son of the Rev. John Lowe, of Ardley Rectory, Bicester, and was educated at Oxford. He was of the old Evangelical school, and as a parochial clergyman much esteemed by his people at Willingdon. His wife—a French lady—died some years ago. A daughter of the deceased married Mr. Tew, of the well-known Yorkshire Bank at Wakefield, and there is also a son. For some years the rev. gentleman was chairman of the Eastbourne Board of Guardians, and his naturally sympathetic disposition well fitted him for the post. Only a few nights since he drove five miles in the pouring rain to attend a Church Defence meeting at Eastbourne, when the chill of being out in such weather hastened his death. He took his degree at Oriel College, Oxford, in 1839, and, having been Vice-Principal of Chichester Theological College since 1843, was presented by the Dean and Chapter to the vicarage of Willingdon. He was made a Prebendary of the Cathedral in 1878, and served as Rural Dean of Pevensey from 1867 to 1874, when he resigned.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS.
HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT.
Testimonial
From MRS. LAVANIA FOWLER, 2, New Pond Cottage, Romsey, Hants.

"It affords me great pleasure to state that your **ELECTROPATHIC BELT** has not only removed the pain I have so long suffered, but has been the means of so strengthening my **spine** as to prevent the recurrence of any difficulty I have had in breathing."

SPINAL WEAKNESS.

Every man and woman suffering from any disorder of the **Nerves, Stomach, Liver, or Kidneys,** should at once stop physicing, and remit 21*s*. for HARNESS' ELECTROPATHIC BELT (post free) and obtain immediate relief. Pamphlet and Book of Testimonials POST FREE. **MEDICAL BATTERY CO. Ltd.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1887.

CAUSES OF THE MENTAL DIFFERENCES IN MEN AND WOMEN.

IN recent articles we have described the mental qualities wherein men differ from women. We now propose to point out some of the causes which have operated in producing this differentiation of the sexes. Differences of the same kind are found to exist in all mammalian animals, so that some of the causes, whatever they be, must be common to animals as well as to men. The Darwinian principles of selection—both natural and sexual—if ever they have operated in any part of organic nature, must certainly have operated in this department. Thus Darwin himself says :—

> Amongst the half-human progenitors of man, and amongst savages, there have been struggles between the males during many generations for the possession of the females. But mere bodily strength and size would do little for victory, unless associated with courage, perseverance, and determined energy. . . . To avoid enemies or to attack them with success, to capture wild animals, and to fashion weapons requires reason, invention, or imagination. . . . These latter faculties, as well as the former, have been developed in man partly through sexual selection—that is, through the contest of rival males—and partly through natural selection—that is, from success in the general struggle for life; and as in both cases the struggle will have been during maturity, the characters gained will have been transmitted more fully to the male than to the female offspring. . . . Thus man has ultimately become superior to woman. It is, indeed, fortunate that the law of the equal transmission of characters to both sexes prevails with mammals; otherwise it is probable that man would have become as superior in mental endowment to woman as the peacock is in ornamental plumage to the pea-hen.

Mr. Francis Galton writes :—

> The fundamental and intrinsic differences of character that exist in individuals are well illustrated by those that distinguish the two sexes, and which begin to assert themselves even in the nursery, where all children are treated alike. One notable peculiarity in the woman is that she is capricious and coy, and has less straightforwardness than the man. It is the same with the female of every species.

If then the principles of selection have determined greater strength of body, and therefore, as we hold, of mind also, on the part of male animals throughout the whole mammalian class, it would certainly have been a most unaccountable fact if any exception to the rule had occurred in the case of mankind. For as regards natural selection, it is in the case of mankind that the highest premium has been placed upon the mental faculties; in other words, it is here that natural selection has been most active in the evolution of intellect. Again, as regards sexual selection, it is evident that in all the more advanced stages of civilisation—or in the stages where mental evolution is highest, and therefore mental differences most pronounced—marriages are determined quite as much by psychical as by physical endowments, and as men always admire in women what they regard as feminine qualities of mind, while women admire in men the distinctively masculine, sexual selection, by thus acting directly as well as indirectly on the mental qualities of both, is constantly engaged in moulding the minds of each upon a different pattern. Such we take to be the chief, or at least the primary, causes of the mental differences in the sexes. Besides these, however, there are several other causes working in the same direction. The principles of selection, for instance, have operated in the endowment of the weaker partner with slenderness and grace, and consequently with comparative refinement of organisation. It is evident that general refinement of this kind indirectly affects the mind in many ways. Again, as to bodily strength, it is evident that the comparative inferiority of women becomes the cause of their comparative timidity, sense of dependence, and distrust of their own powers. Hence also their comparative feebleness of will and vacillation of purpose; they are conscious of lacking the muscular strength which in the last resort is the measure of executive capacity. Hence, also, their resort to petty acts and pretty ways for securing their aims; and hence, in a great measure, their strongly religious disposition. To the masculine character, accustomed to rely on its own strength, the need of external aid, even of a supernatural kind, is not felt to be so urgent as to the feminine character, whose only hope is in the strong arm of another. "The position of man is to stand, of woman to lean"; and although it may be difficult for a manly nature to contemplate the approach of death with a stoic calm, it is not so impossible as it is for the more shrinking and emotional nature of a woman. Lastly, from her abiding sense of weakness and dependence, there arises the deeply-rooted desire to please the opposite sex. There is another psychological agency, which exerts enormous influence in differentiating the minds of men and women. In expanding all the tender emotions, in exciting the purest affection, in imposing the duties of rigid self-denial, in arousing the consciousness of protecting the utterly weak and helpless consigned by nature to her charge, the maternal instincts are to woman the strongest of all influences in the determination of character. These instincts continue to operate long after the child has ceased to be an infant. Constant association with her growing children imparts to the mother a fulness of emotional life, which is admittedly feminine, and encourages the growth of all the altruistic feelings so distinctive of woman. According to the general law of inheritance, these influences would become cumulative in successive generations. Next week we propose to examine the influence of education in mentally differentiating the sexes, and to inquire whether the higher culture is physically injurious to women.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

PARTIES IN THE IRISH CHURCH.

SIR,—I have been looking through the numbers of the PULPIT for the last few months, and though on the 12th November you said the discussion on the merits of the Irish Prayer-book must cease, I hope you will permit me to say, in reply to a statement made in the PULPIT of that date by a writer signing himself "Even-Handed Justice," to the effect that there was an alliance between the Low and the Broad Church parties in the Irish Synod by which Low helped Broad to remove the Athanasian Creed from public worship, while Broad helped Low to introduce the new question and answer into the Catechism, declaring the doctrine of Holy Communion. I have been a member of the General Synod from the time of disestablishment, and a witness of most, if not all, of the chief debates on the Revised Prayer-book; and I never heard such an alliance hinted at, in either public debate or private conversation. The Broad Churchmen in Ireland are too few to form a party.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, December 11th, 1887.

REFORMED BURIALS.

SIR,—Dr. Hubbard in the *Standard* writes that the undertakers have it in their power to substitute a simpler mode of burial for that now prevalent. I beg leave to differ from him. Undertakers are just what the public make them. Until there be a common agreement there can be no general response on the part of those who are the servants of the public. There is need of a revolution in the belief of the people, before any substantial change can be effected. The words of the Apostle must be driven home, "We sow not that body that shall be," and "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." As also the words of Socrates, "I care not whether you burn or bury my body, provided you do not say that you have burned or buried Socrates." So long as the notion obtains that it is the material body which shall rise again, so long will the old practices continue to be observed.

Not that I would see the body treated with disrespect or unconcern. It has been the temple of the Holy Ghost, and ought not to endure the indignity of long retention above ground, or the ignominy of being thrust with many other dead bodies into the same pit, or enclosed in a condition of arrested decay in an imperishable coffin in a vault. It ought rather to be committed to mother earth as completely as is consistent with decency and right feeling. It rests, therefore, with the public teacher rather than with the undertaker to bring about the desired reform.

F. LAWRENCE, B.A., Vicar of Westow,
York, Hon. Sec. of the Church of England
Burial Reform Association.
16, King Street, Cheapside, E.C.

THE GOLD DISCOVERY IN WALES.

SIR,—I wish to give a word of warning to the general public, and especially to those who cannot afford to lose their money, that they must not accept without question the glowing accounts of the finding of gold in North Wales. At the same time, I am well aware that gold has been found for many years past on the mountains on both sides of the Mawddach Valley, between Dolgelly, Barmouth, and Festiniog. Eight or ten years ago, I walked four thousand miles in North Wales, and travelled some thousands more by rail, coach, boat, etc., in the preparation of my "Practical Guide to North Wales," and I visited almost every nook and corner in the district now brought so prominently before the public. I was on every mountain top, across all the passes, up the valleys and streams, and did not neglect to visit the reputed gold mines. At Dolgelly, Trawsfynydd, and other places, I heard many stories of Australian prospectors who had said that there was workable gold in the district, and of some who had succeeded in forming companies which afterwards came to grief. I had been with a friend in the same district some time before, when on one of my first pedestrian excursions, and had then walked right up the extremely beautiful valley of the Mawddach. We met at the inn at Trawsfynydd with one of those very Australians, and heard accounts similar in wonder to those now being given. A gentleman, at a small hotel near Barmouth, showed us a nugget of gold said to have been found in a mine on the mountains near, and he talked of investing in the mine with the hope of making a fortune. The mountains there are known to the geologist as consisting of some of the most ancient rocks in the British Isles, such as the Cambrian, which in some other countries are found to be gold-bearing rocks; and no doubt there is gold in Wales, but whether in such quantities as will pay for working, I am very doubtful. By all means, let those who can afford to make the trial do so, and by actual search settle the vexed question. Again, however, let me caution those to be wary who cannot invest their money happily without a tolerably sure prospect of a good return; for people who are so enthusiastic in favour of gold mining in Wales will, I fear, find they have been building castles in the air, and producing a foolish repetition of the El Dorado of old.

HENRY IRWIN JENKINSON.

Keswick, Cumberland.

◆

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

SIR,—I have been reading an article in the *Dublin Review* for October by the Romish Bishop Headley. It professes to answer Dr. St. George Mivart in the *Nineteenth Century* for July. I have also read the leading article in the *Church Times* for the 9th inst. on the same subject. The main point of the whole thing is the case of Galileo, and the bearing of his case on Papal Infallibility. After reading and pondering on the various arguments, one comes to the conclusion that what Romanists mean by infallibility is that the present Pope is infallible, and that as to the utterances of former infallibles, all he has to do is to put on them whatever infallible meaning suits his present needs. In fact what *they* said is vain—the whole thing is what *he* says, and yet as the Pope's *ex-Cathedrâ* utterances come counter-signed by Cardinal Simeoni, Quarantotti, Antonelli, or some other official, they are, if unpalatable, treated with utter contempt as the mere *dicta* of Simeoni or others. The Pope forsooth is infallible; but all he says may be despised as the notions of his secretary. Thus we say the Queen can do no wrong, all the wrong is done by Gladstone or Lord Salisbury. When the Pope forbade the collection for Mr. Parnell, Archbishop Croke immediately paid £50, and his clergy made up £1,500, and it is called a "Pseudo-circular" in the Priests' Organ in Dublin. So really Romish Ecclesiastics make so little of this infallibility, that it is no wonder it has no attraction to us as if of any practical utility.

Romanism is a most extraordinary system. I call it Romanism, not in contempt, but because union with Rome is its keystone. Formerly it gloried in the names Papists and Popery, because the Pope is all in all with them. I can't call them Catholics, because we are that ourselves; and here they are schismatics. Roman Catholics they may be at Rome, they cannot be so here. So I speak of the Romish Church, but I do so merely because I don't know what else to call them without sacrifice of principle. But this system is a most extraordinary one. You are to use private judgment to weigh its claims; but once having adopted them you are no longer to use your senses, either to judge its doctrines or to retire if unsatisfied. You may judge a shop from the outside, but once in you must not decide what you will buy or put on, and you must not dare to go elsewhere,—you are to choose your guide by the use of your eyesight, &c.; but then you are to allow your eyes to be blinded for the rest of your life. This is strange? Then look at one of their strongest arguments for their infallibility, or the universal church's infallibility. It is said in Malachi that "the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and that men should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts." On this is built that they cannot err, nor we in following them. From whence it follows that our Lord whom they condemned was an impostor. Dr. Mivart is a specimen of the kind of converts who do them more harm than good; they cannot be absorbed, they tend to cause disruption in the body. Perhaps it would be better to admit converts when past consciousness, as often has been done. Else it should be a condition that a man should bind himself to believe both what he cannot understand, and also what he sees to be impossible. Such submission is actually necessary. Is it not impossible for a body remaining a body, to be in ninety places at once? Is it not beyond understanding that a body should be a spiritual body, in their sense, not St. Paul's. Is it not beyond comprehension that a body should be present spiritually, except by effects, influence, &c., and like the sun. But this they spurn as heretical. Their region of faith is in the impossible and the incomprehensible; and, therefore, men like Dr. Mivart can never acclimate themselves to their system. There is no use in quoting names like Dr. Newman's. It is only fools who swallow a system which they do not understand, or which they see to be impossible. Dr. Newman indeed is a mystery, and Dr. Mivart is unmanageable, but the rest of their converts seem merely fools, who believe they know not what, or things as impossible as that two and two make five.

As to infallibility, the Pope for the time being has it as tenant for life, to do what he likes with it for the time. But it is strictly entailed like an estate, and when a new one comes, he turns all upside down exactly as he pleases. Thus the incoming owner can cut and pull down and build up, only leaving the estate and its rights to his successor. The Pope can do and does exactly the same. What cares the present Pope for the Leos and the Gregories of the past? They had their day once and he has his now.

C. C., V.-G.

Reviews and Notices.

"BIBLE WARNINGS, ADDRESSES TO CHILDREN." By the Rev. Richard Newton, D.D. London: James Nisbet and Co. 1887. 378 pages.

THIS volume we have pleasure in recommending to our readers as a suitable gift to the young, and especially at this season of the year, when many are anxious to give away useful books. It contains sermons which were delivered by the Rev. Richard Newton on the Warnings in the Bible against lying, anger, pride, selfishness, and other sins, and these are now published together. The author hopes he may thus help "the young to understand these warnings, and so escape the dangers to which they refer." The volume is attractively bound, printed in large, clear type, on good paper, with illustrations, full of anecdotes, and the style of writing is very interesting. And what is of no small advantage in such books, it is provided with an accurate index.

◆

"FINGAL AND ITS CHURCHES," by the Rev. Robert Walsh, A.M., Rector of Malahide and Portmarnach. Dublin: McGee, Nassau Street, price 6s.

THIS is a most creditable publication, full of learning and research. It follows well in the steps of Dwyer's "Killaloe," and the works of Bishop Reeves, Professor Stokes, &c. It is rich in woodcuts, showing what the old churches were, and what such a man as Lord Ardilaun is now engaged in building. The Appendices are most valuable, and show an immensity of labour. Mr. Walsh can not only collect and recount, he can also philosophise to good purpose. At page 161 we have an answer to the question, "Why was the English conqueror far more successful in Romanising than in Reforming the Ancient Irish Church?" Mr. Walsh thus replies, "Those who sent, and those who carried out, the mandate of 1172 were in earnest about both the worldly and the religious policy which they introduced, and they made the first largely subservient to the second. Those who sent, and those who carried out, the mandate of 1535, were in earnest about the worldly policy only. Then again, in 1172, the power, which imposed Romanism, was strong as well as thorough, while the Church, which received it, was weak. In 1535 the influence which introduced the Reformation, was weak, as well as half-hearted; the Church, to which it was sent, was strong in its power, as well as will, to resist." The Reformed Church was reduced to such beggary that many parishes combined were hardly sufficient to keep a man from starving. The higher preferments were filled from England by men who cared for their cures only so far they enabled them to go back again and live as absentees. Had England wished the Reformation to fail she could not have managed us more to the purpose than she has. We might quote largely from this most valuable book, but our space forbids. Two short remarks only can we copy out. At page 195 we read "the Irish Roman Catholic peasant, when, in some perhaps not distant day, he is awakened to the real needs of his higher nature, may yet rejoice to find that there is a Church in his native land which, entirely unlike the Church to which his allegiance has hitherto been given, holds forth the word of truth at all times, and whose ministers do not, and will not, debase the moral law to the low standard of a passing social or political struggle." And again, page 194, "the responsibility for this," our want of success, "lies, not with the Irish Church, but with those English statesmen, whose representatives in the present day, and within our own memories, falsely accused her of being guilty of default and failure, and then cruelly punished her for that very want of success which their forefathers had made well nigh impossible." The same is now tried on the Welsh Church and the Scotch Establishment; and, no doubt, in hope of gaining English Radicals and Irish rebels as tools for setting up again a broken-down idol, will be tried even on the English Church, which has spread her arms throughout the whole world.

◆

"DE INCARNATIONE VERBI DEI." Religious Tract Society. (Christian Classic Series.)

THE Religious Tract Society has done well in issuing this Christian Classic Series. No study ought to be helped in every possible way more than history, for, to quote Bishop Stubbs, "there is in the study of history a gradual approximation to a consciousness that we are growing into a perception of the workings of the Almighty Ruler of the world, that we are growing able to justify the eternal wisdom, and by that justification to approve ourselves His children, that we are coming to see a hand of justice and mercy, a hand of progress and order, a kind and wise disposition, ever leading the world on to the better, but never forcing it; and out of the evil of man's working bringing continually that which is good." And one very great help to the study of history is to give the student every facility for reading authorities; the writings of the men who made history. Now ordinary men have seldom time or opportunity for doing much in this way; but such a series as this supplies to some extent at any rate the want. And the way in which the book is got up adds to the pleasure of reading it. Print and paper lend their aid to the historic imagination, and the book not only reads like but feels like a classic; it is not as the latest German theory which to-day is and to-morrow is thrown into the waste paper-basket.

It can hardly be expected that we should review the *De Incarnatione*. Yet it would be well worth a review. It is exceedingly interesting, the more so for that it was written before the weary period of word-battles began in the Eastern Church which finally killed its Christianity. No volume is more sadly interesting than Neander's fourth volume. One feels that nothing was left but for Mohammed to come and sweep away the whole. But the *De Incarnatione* was written before the rise of the Arian heresy, and is quite free from personalities and polemics. The reasoning is quite calm—to instruct not to refute, the treatise is built on the argument that the love of God must bring redemption to fallen man, a different line from Anselm's in *Cur Deus Homo*, where sin is looked on mainly from a forensic point of view.

The mode of argument is thoroughly scriptural, but not according to modern use. The Divinity of Christ does not in the least depend on the dative case, nor on the authorship of a Gospel. Athanasius is quite contented to quote the sense only of Scripture, and with him Scripture is a large expression, including the Book of Wisdom, at any rate; and he uses the LXX. not the Hebrew. It would be very interesting to read Athanasius just after Canon Liddon's well-known Bampton Lectures. Both are very able demonstrations of Christ's Divinity, but their lines of argument are not exactly the same. It would be profitable also, as well as enjoyable; and we thank the Religious Tract Society for the opportunity of doing so under very favourable circumstances.

◆

THE Sunday evening Lectures on Church Doctrine will be resumed next term at Great St. Mary's, Cambridge, when there will be a course of five lectures on the Christian Ministry. Mr. Stanton of Trinity will lecture on "The Threefold Ministry"; Mr. E. G. Wood, of Emmanuel, on "The Priesthood of Our Lord"; Mr. Whittaker, of St. John's, on "The Priesthood of the Laity"; Mr. Watson, of St. John's, on "The Eucharistic Sacrifice"; and Mr. J. W. Hicks, of Sidney, on "Confession and Absolution."

ON the 13th inst. the Bishop of Llandaff opened an iron Mission church at Coedpenmaen, in the parish of St. Catharine's, Pontypridd, erected for the benefit of a population of 1,500 persons who have settled there within the last eighteen months. The sermon was preached by his lordship, who after the Second Lesson baptised four adults and twenty-seven children. The new church will accommodate about two hundred worshippers. On the preceding Sunday the Bishop held a confirmation at the parish church at Pontlottyn. The candidates numbered 121, of whom all except four were over twenty years of age, and 116 were recent converts from various Nonconformist bodies, including one Roman Catholic. Last November twenty-one adults were baptised in this parish.

THE consecration of Archdeacon Matthew as Bishop of Lahore will take place at Westminster Abbey on the Feast of the Epiphany.

INTELLIGENCE has been received at Thirsk of the safe arrival at Adelaide of the vessel in which the Bishop of Bathurst (Dr. Camidge) sailed.

ON Sunday morning Professor Lumby, Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, was installed at York as Prebendary of Wetwang, in succession to Dr. Camidge, Bishop of Bathurst.

BISHOP WOODFORD, a few months before his death, established an Order of Mission Preachers and Lecturers for the diocese of Ely, and in view of connecting it closely with the cathedral appointed one of the Canons, Archdeacon Chapman, to the wardenship; but as the society has lately largely increased, and a wide field of work seems to be opening out, he has found that the duties of the office are likely to interfere with his archidiaconal calls. Canon Luckock, having resigned the principalship of the theological college which he has held since its foundation, has been asked by the Bishop to become warden of the order in his place, and he will thus be able to give his services to the diocese in congenial work, and will devote himself to the development of a scheme which gives promise of much usefulness. Its main object is the advancement of holy living amongst the clergy and laity by promoting and assisting in missions, special services, courses of sermons and addresses, Retreats and Quiet Days, as well as by lectures on Biblical exegesis, the Prayer-book, and Church history. For the latter branch of the work Cambridge, being contained within the diocese, offers peculiar facilities for securing eminently qualified lecturers, and the new warden from his intimate connection with the University will be able to turn this advantage to the best account. Parochial Missions have been tried, and their value in awakening and quickening the spiritual life is fully recognised, but the system of public lectures on definite dogmatic teaching in towns and villages has not yet been adopted on any large scale. We anticipate much good from the experiment.

THE Bishop of Chichester has offered the vicarage of Cuckfield to the Rev. T. Hughes Cooper, by whom it has been accepted. Mr. Cooper was formerly curate of Cuckfield, under the late Vicar, the Rev. T. A. Maberly. He was subsequently curate at St. Paul's, Brighton, and whilst there was presented to the rectory of Tarporley, Cheshire, where he has been for some years. He married in 1872 a daughter of the late Bishop Villiers, of Durham.—The living of St. Martin, Brighton vacant by the appointment of the Rev. R. I. Salmon to Barcombe, has been accepted by the Rev. Charles Hardy Little, younger brother of Canon Knox Little, and curate of Christ Church, St. Leonard's. In 1880 Mr. Little was appointed English Chaplain at St. Petersburgh, but was obliged to resign this important and lucrative post in 1885, owing to the ill-health of Mrs. Little. He then went to reside at St. Leonard's, where he has since officiated as one of the curates of Christ Church. Mr. Little is an M.A. of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, and Trinity College, Dublin. He was ordained deacon in 1870, and priest in the following year, by the Bishop of Oxford. The living of St. Martin was offered to the Rev. F. J. Mount immediately on the resignation of the Rev. R. I. Salmon. In the same week Mr. Mount was offered and accepted the Archdeaconry and Canonry of Chichester.—*Sussex Daily News.*

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baker, Rev. Caspar Lewis Vashon, Rector of Stanford-on-Soar, Notts.

Bowden, Rev. C. H., Chaplain of Guy's Hospital.

Burdett, Rev. H. M., M.A., Vicar of North Molton and Twitchen, Devonshire.

Carruthers, Rev. C., M.A., Rector of Aston-sub-Edge, Gloucestershire.

Cooper, Rev. J. Hughes, Rector of Tarporley, Cheshire; Vicar of Cuckfield, Sussex.

Crellin, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Chaplain to Her Majesty's Prison, Derby.

Evans, Rev. Daniel, B.A., Rector of Llanmaes; Rector of Gilestone.

Evans, Rev. Canon W. Howell, Vicar of Oswestry; Vicar of Potton, Bedfordshire.

Godley, Rev. Edward Richard, Rector of East Chelborough, Dorchester.

Hayman, Rev. Henry Telford, B.A., Vicar of Perlethorpe, Notts.

Hutchinson, Rev. C. B., Vicar of St. John's, Forton; Rector of Wonston, Hants.

King, Rev. Herbert Poole, Rector of Stourton, Wilts.

Lacon, Rev. Charles H., M.A., Vicar of Wangford-cum-Henham and Reydon; Rector of Branstone, Grantham.

Lister-Courtier, Rev. Frederick William Hall, M.A., Vicar of Dorrington, Sleaford.

Little, Rev. Charles H., Vicar of St. Martin's, Brighton.

Longe, Rev. John Charles, M.A., Vicar of Linton, Cambridgeshire.

Madan, Rev. George, M.A., Honorary Canon of Gloucester Cathedral.

May, Rev. Dr. F. Schiller, formerly Curate of Christ Church, Paddington; Sunday Evening Lecturer at St. Mary-le-Bow, Cheapside.

Morgan, Rev. Lewis, M.A., Vicar of Ainstable, Cumberland.

Murray, Rev. George W., Vicar of Shrivenham, Berks; Rural Dean of the Vale of White Horse.

Phillips, Rev. H., Vicar of St. Katharine's, Felton Common, Bristol.

Pigot, Rev. Prebendary, Vicar of Fremington; Chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter.

Price, Rev. Arthur Rolls, M.A., Curate of Aberdare, Glamorgan; Rector of Hethe, Bicester, Oxon.

Reed, Rev. Samuel, Precentor of Ripon Cathedral.

Starkey, Rev. George Augustus, Vicar of Whiteparish, Wilts.

Tucker, Rev. Walter Challis, Association Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society; Vicar of St. Matthew's, West Kensington Park.

Whitaker, Rev. C. P., B.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.

White, Rev. H. Vere, Rector of Almontin; Rector of Killesk, Arthurstown, *viâ* Waterford.

White, Rev. Reginald A. R., M.A., Senior Curate of Fareham; Vicar of Titchfield, Hants.

Wickham, Rev. L., Head Master of Twyford School; Vicar of Is-y-Coed, near Wrexham.

Williams, Rev. Robert, B.A., Curate of Llandudno; Vicar of Dolwyddelen, Carnarvonshire.

Wilson, Rev. J. C., Chaplain of Paignton Cemetery.

Winckley, Rev. S. T., Curate; Vicar of St. Catharine's, Nottingham.

Wrenford, Rev. Edwin, Vicar of Lempringham, Lincolnshire.

◆

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brown, Rev. Arthur T., Vicar of Holy Trinity Church, Selhurst, at 10, Dagnall Park Villas, Selhurst, on the 20th inst., aged 59.

Cautley, Rev. Edmund Harling, M.A., late of York, formerly Rector of Kildale, Yorkshire, at Elstree, Herts, on the 16th inst., aged 60.

Elton, Rev. Charles Allen, B.D., formerly Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, at Florence Villa, Belvedere, Kent, on the 17th inst., aged 67.

Kingdon, Rev. James Henry, Priest, only surviving son of J. S. Kingdon, 32, Clifton Gardens, at St. John's Rectory, Harbour Island, Bahamas, suddenly, of hæmorrhage of the lung, on Nov. 17th, aged 31.

Owen, Rev. H., for twenty-seven years Rector of Trusthorpe, at Llandaff, on the 17th inst., aged 67.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CELTIC MISSIONS OF IONA AND LINDISFARNE.

By the BISHOP of DURHAM.

Sermon Preached in Newcastle Cathedral, on Sunday, November 20th, 1887.

"Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn."—Is. li. 1.

AT a great crisis in their national history the prophet directs the thoughts of the chosen people to the lessons of a remote past. He bids them find inspiration and guidance in the first beginnings of their race. They were separated by a chasm of twelve or thirteen centuries from the day when their shepherd forefather left his far-off Syrian home to grasp the splendid destiny which God's purpose had marked out for his race. Yet this long interval, with its amazing vicissitudes had not broken the continuity of their national life. The prosperity of a Church, as of a nation, depends largely on its connection with the past. Progress is not severance. A healthy Church is not indeed the slave, but it is essentially the child and the pupil of the past. The accumulated lessons of its bygone history are its rich inheritance–lessons learnt alike from its failures and its successes. Shall I do wrong then if, on this last morning of your dedication festival, I plant my foot in the prophet's track, and invite you—the latest sons and daughters of the Northumbrian Church—to look to the rock whence you were hewn, to glance for a few moments at the earliest history—the Celtic period—of the Northumbrian Church, and to draw thence the inspiring lessons which it promises to yield. In this octave of dedication services you celebrate the transformation of the ancient parish church into the cathedral of a new diocese; but this building, so transformed, is the outward embodiment, the local symbol, of the latest development of the Northumbrian Church—the foundation of the see of Newcastle. Is it not, then, an opportune moment to revert to the cradle of its history, and thus link together the last days with the first in the bonds of a natural piety? In this long lapse of time much has happened. Dynasties have risen and fallen. The English Crown, the English Parliament, the English Nation itself, have come into being. But what then? The interval between this latest growth of the Northumbrian Church and its earliest beginnings is roughly the same as that which separated the prophet's utterance in the text from the call of Abraham, the forefather of the race. The value of the lessons is only increased by the lapse of time. And indeed there has been no more brilliant epoch in the history of Northumbria than those earliest days. Northumbria has never been so great a power in England, or indeed in Christendom, as she was in that remote age. Northumbria bore the chief part in the making of the English Church, as she did likewise in the making of the English State. Shall I be thought to overstrain my analogy if I begin by comparing the migration of St. Columba from his Irish home to the migration of Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees—the one the initiative of the Northumbrian Church as the other was the initiative of the Israelite people? A voluntary exile, like the patriarch of old, he obeyed the Divine call, and went forth, not knowing whither he went. He chose, we are told, as his adopted home the lonely, sterile, unlovely island, which henceforth was to bear his name, because from its shores he could no longer gaze on the country which he loved with a tender, passionate love. Passionate indeed he was, passionate in his wrath, as he was passionate in his love. His was no faultless character. He had all the defects and all the virtues of his race in a heightened form. He was headstrong alike in his attractions and his repulsions: now fierce in his vindictiveness, and now melting into tenderness; a nature of the strongest contrasts, a fountain sending forth both sweet water and bitter. But it is not for us—members of the Northumbrian Church—to lay our finger on the dark blots which stained so beautiful a picture. If he was not an apostle, not a saint, to others, at least to us, the heirs of his self-devotion, he was both in the highest degree. It is far pleasanter to note how the beauty of his character shone out, and the ugliness vanished, under the influence of his evangelistic work in his self-chosen exile. The very incident which led to his exile reveals the strong contrasts in his nature. He had a quarrel about the possession of the Psalter, which he considered to have been wrongly adjudged to another. He stirred up a deadly strife between clan and clan to avenge the wrong. Overwhelmed with penitence, he pledged himself to win as many souls to Christ as bodies had been slain in the murderous conflict. His exile was the expiation of his sin, the redemption of his pledge. "It is thou who art my father," said the faithful disciple who accompanied him. "My country is where I can gather the largest harvest for Christ." The words of the disciple reflect the spirit of the teacher. And so the harvesting of souls for Christ began. For thirty long years Iona was the centre of his evangelistic work. Never man laboured more earnestly or more successfully for Christ. When the sixth century was fast drawing to its close, he passed away—about the same time when Augustine landed on the shores of Kent. His missionary work was altogether independent of Rome. The Roman legions had long been withdrawn from Britain. They had never penetrated into Ireland. But the influence of the Roman Church was largely dependent on the extension of the Roman Empire. Hence Celtic Christianity grew up a strictly native growth. The influence of Rome for long centuries was practically unfelt. Whether for good or for evil, the "island of the saints" developed a type of Christian civilisation and Christian character peculiar to itself. Long after the English Church had submitted to the Roman domination, the Irish Church remained essentially free. It was not till the twelfth century when Hadrian, the English Pope, made over Ireland to Henry II., that along with the English conquest the yoke of Roman dictation was firmly riveted on the neck of the ancient Irish Church. This independence Columba brought with him to his new island home off the west coast of Scotland. Iona became now the light of Christendom. For many generations it was the centre of the great evangelistic movements of the time. Not England nor Scotland only, but large parts of the Continent also were Christianised by these Irish missionaries either from their adopted home in Iona, or from their mother country. But what of Northumbria meanwhile? Paulinus had advanced northward from the Roman mission in Kent; he had preached for a time to our heathen forefathers in Northumbria; but he had made no way. Disheartened by his royal patron's defeat and death, he abandoned the field and retired southward to a more congenial sphere of work. The country remained pagan still. Not a single Church, not a single altar, no symbol of the Gospel of any kind, Bede tells us, had been erected between the Forth and the Tees. For the Christian Missionary it was virgin soil still. Then Iona stepped in where Rome had failed. Some two years after the retirement of Paulinus, Aidan left the shores of Iona and took up his abode at Lindisfarne. Oswald, the king, educated as an exile in Iona, naturally sought thence the teacher who should win his newly recovered kingdom for Christ. The story of Aidan's selection for the work is too well known to need repetition here. It is a noble testimony to the character of the man, his simplicity and his gentleness, his absolute self-renunciation, and his unflinching faith. Never did the pure flame of the evangelistic spirit burn more brightly in any man. He had all the excellences of Columba—his melting sympathy, his fervid zeal, his directness of purpose. But we have none of the grave blots which sully the master's character—no irascibility, no vindictiveness, nothing of the headstrong and ungovernable passion. The capabilities of the Celtic character were moulded and tempered by the Spirit of Christ. It was in the year 635—a little more than seventy years after Columba landed in Iona—just thirty years after the death of Augustine, that Aidan commenced his work. Though forty years had elapsed since Augustine's first landing in England, Christianity was still confined to its first conquest—the south-east corner of the island, the kingdom of Kent. Beyond this border, though ground had been broken here and there, no territory had been permanently acquired for the Gospel. Then commenced those thirty years of earnest, energetic labour, carried on by these Celtic missionaries and their disciples from Lindisfarne as their spiritual citadel which ended in the submission of England to the gentle yoke of Christ. Not Augustine, but Aidan, is the true apostle of England. Before I pass away from this Celtic period—the most attractive (and in a spiritual aspect) the most splendid in the annals of our Church—and proceed to speak of the Roman submission, let me dwell for a moment on the two great facts which this history reveals. These are the success of the Celtic preachers and the independence of the Celtic Missions.

1. Of the triumphs of the Celtic Evangelists something has been said already. If we desire to know the secret of this success it is soon told. It was the power of earnest, simple, self-denying lives, pleading with a force which no eloquence of words can command. But whatever may be the explanation, the fact remains. Iona succeeded where Rome had failed. Lest I should seem to exaggerate or to heighten the colouring, I prefer to tell the tale not in my own language, but in words taken from the accomplished writer of the Roman Communion:—"From the cloisters of Lindisfarne (writes Montalembert) and from the heart of those districts, in which the popularity of ascetic pontiffs such as Aidan, and martyr kings such as Oswald and Oswin, took day by day a deeper root, Northumbrian Christianity spread over the southern kingdoms. What is distinctly visible is the influence of Celtic priests and missionaries everywhere replacing and seconding Roman missionaries, and reaching districts which their predecessors had never been able to enter. The stream of the Divine Word thus extended itself from north to south, and its slow but certain course reached in succession all the peoples of the Heptarchy." And again, at the close of the chapter of which these are the opening words, he writes:—"Of the eight kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxon Confederation, that of Kent alone was exclusively won and retained by the Roman monks, whose first attempts among the East Saxons and Northumbrians ended in failure. In Essex and in East Anglia the Saxons of the west and the Angles of the east were converted by the combined action of Continental missionaries and Celtic monks. As to the two Northumbrian kingdoms and those of Essex and Mercia, which comprehended in themselves more than two-thirds of the territory occupied by the German conquerors,

these four countries owed their final conversion exclusively to the peaceful invasion of the Celtic monks, who not only rivalled the zeal of the Roman monks, but who, the first obstacles once surmounted, showed much more perseverance and gained much more success." Sussex still remained heathen—Sussex the immediate neighbour of the Roman missionaries in Kent. Sussex was at length stormed and taken. And here again the conqueror of this last stronghold of heathendom, though an ardent champion of the Roman cause, was a Northumbrian by birth. Wilfrid had been a pupil of Aidan, and his missionary inspiration was drawn from Lindisfarne. Was I not right then in claiming for Aidan the first place in the evangelisation of our race? Augustine was the Apostle of Kent, but Aidan was the Apostle of England.

2. The independence of the Celtic Missions again is a patent fact, and stands out in strong contrast to later evangelistic movements in Western Europe. Rome neither initiated nor controlled these Celtic Missions. The missionaries owed allegiance not to the Bishop of Rome, but to the Presbyter-abbot of Iona. There is no evidence that they sought or accepted any authoritative directions from the Roman Mission in the south of England. Their usages were different in many respects from the usages of Rome. When these came under discussion, and it was a question between allegiance to Iona and allegiance to Rome, they unhesitatingly chose the former. It is probable indeed that, if asked, they would have granted a precedency to the great Patriarch of the West, the Bishop of the world's metropolis; but it is quite plain, on the other hand, that in their eyes he had no constitutional right to command them. Roman direction is treated as absolutely valueless by them; Roman wishes are altogether disregarded. Sooner than abandon the traditions and customs of Iona for those of Rome, they retire from the field, leaving the rich fruits of their labours to others at the very moment when the harvest is full ripe. The Abbot of Iona—the successor of Columba—is their acknowledged ruler, the ruler even of Bishops, though only a simple presbyter—their superior in ecclesiastical office, though their inferior in spiritual functions. From him they receive their commission, though not their consecration, and to him they render their account. The Bishop of Rome is in no sense their master.

But this Celtic period was brought suddenly to a close. The rivalry between Rome and Iona came to a head. The dispute was about matters unimportant in themselves. There was the cut of the tonsure, a wholly trivial matter, in which there could not be a right or a wrong. There was the time of the Easter celebration, which was a question of convenience rather than of principle. The real issue lay behind all these disputes about trifles. It was the alternative of allegiance to Rome or allegiance to Iona. The conference was held at Whitby. On the side of Iona were the great "Makers of England"—Hilda the royal abbess, Colman the successor of Aidan, Cedd the great missionary Bishop. But the fiat of the King prevailed. Iona was defeated. The Celtic brotherhood at Lindisfarne was broken up. Colman retired with the Celtic brothers and many of their English scholars to their Scottish home:—"What heart," writes Montalembert, "is so cold as not to understand, to sympathise, and to journey with him along the Northumbrian coast and over the Scottish mountains where, bearing homewards the bones of his father (Aidan), the proud but vanquished spirit returned to his northern mists and buried in the sacred isle of Iona his defeat and his unconquerable fidelity to the traditions of his race." To the English Churchman the event will suggest other and wider reflections besides.

So the Celtic missionaries laboured, and others entered into their labours. Once again the saying was fulfilled, "One soweth and another reapeth." But an irreparable loss was inflicted on the English Church by the withdrawal of this childlike simplicity, this generous devotion, this fervour of missionary zeal. Pious and upright men like Bede, even though their sympathies might be with Rome in the dispute, yet writing while the memory of these Celtic days was fresh, looked back with longing eyes on the departed glory. It was the golden age of saintliness such as England would never see again.

Yet, along with this terrible loss, the change brought some great and immediate practical advantages. To be united with Rome was to be connected with the centre of the highest Christian civilisation and art of the age. What the rude Celtic churches with their walls of timber and their thatch of reeds were to the stone buildings, the "Roman" style, as Bede calls it, introduced by Benedict Biscop from the Continent—this the civilisation of Iona was to the civilisation of Rome. Moreover, Christian Rome had inherited from heathen Rome her great capacity for organisation; and just here lay the main defect of the Celtic churches. The Celtic churches of Ireland remained without complete parochial and diocesan organisation for many centuries later. Still the English subjugation brought with it the Roman ascendency. The English soil was more favourable than the native Irish organisation, and accordingly the Celtic Church of Northumbria fared later. But organisation was still its great want. Thus the connection with Rome supplied the element of progress which at this moment the Celtic Church most needed. Moreover, the Roman submission brought one other paramount advantage. The development of England demanded unity, but unity there was not. Politically, the island was broken up into several independent kingdoms: ecclesiastically, there were two independent

Churches—the Celtic in the north, the Roman in the south. The unity of the Church was the first step towards the unity of the State. At whatever cost this unity was attained at Whitby, and the State soon followed in the wake of the Church. These immediate advantages were so tangible and so patent that it is no surprise to find men like Benedict Biscop and Chad and Bede welcoming the Roman submission. The tremendous ulterior consequences were quite beyond the range of human foresight. Nor must we forget that the submission required by Gregory and his immediate successors was different in kind from the imperious demands of Rome in a later age. Two centuries are yet to elapse before the forgery of the False Decretals furnished a documentary basis for the exacting claims of Rome. Gregory exerted a practical influence in exalting the power of the Roman See second to none of his predecessors; he strained the authority of the patriarchal chair to the utmost; he was far from consistent in his language. But at least he denounces the title of universal Bishop as a "proud and pestilent" assumption, an act of contempt and wrong to the whole priesthood, an imitation of Satan who exalted himself above his fellow angels, a token of the speedy coming of Antichrist.

Thus passed away "this goodliest fellowship" "whereof this world holds record." Of these splendid traditions, of this bright example, of these evangelistic triumphs, you are the heirs. This diocese of Newcastle still enshrines the Holy Island of Lindisfarne, the true cradle of English Christianity. The building, whose completion and adornment we this day celebrate, is in some sense a replacement of the older sanctuary. If it is ever to fulfil its mission, it will become not only the home of more ornate and frequent services, of a more splendid ritual, but before all things the centre of intense missionary and philanthropic work. After all, it was not the splendour, but the simplicity of Iona and of Lindisfarne that won England for Christ. Times are changed. The evangelistic agencies of that age were modelled on the monastic type. None other, so far as we can see, could then have done the work so well. Times are changed. No one would wish now to replace the stately pile of William of Carileph by the wooden shed of Finan. Art, music, poetry, architecture—all the choicest adornments of life which God has given us—these we are bound to render to the service of the sanctuary, not selfishly keeping our best for our private homes. But while all else changes, the spirit is unchanged. The simplicity, the self-devotion, the prayerfulness, the burning love of Christ, which shone forth in those Celtic missionaries of old, must be your spiritual equipment now. Then, when your work is done, and when another generation shall have taken your place, it may be that some future Bede will again trace in words of tender and regretful sympathy, as a lesson for later ages, the undying record of a Christlike life and work.

THE PRESENT HOPES OF THE CHURCH.

By the Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D., Master of University College, Durham.

Sermon Preached at the Ordination of the Bishop of Durham, in Durham Cathedral, on the 4th Sunday in Advent, 1887.

> "For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, to the intent that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world; looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works."—Titus ii. 11-14 (R.V.).

THE words of him who has been commissioned to address you this morning must be wary and few. At a time when thoughts are deep, and feelings intense, there is danger lest what is spoken should disturb the solemn impressions which have been already made rather than strengthen them, and lest at the opening of a long service, so full of holy and awful interests to those for whom it is appointed, words should be spoken which, by their tone, might seem to be out of harmony with the hearts of those who hear, or by their length should weary them.

For eighteen centuries the Pastoral Epistles have been the storehouse to which the Church has sent its clergy for instructions as to how they are to conduct themselves, both in their own lives and in their dealings with others, as ministers of Christ. And to those who have not yet selected a passage of Scripture to keep by them in remembrance of this great crisis in their lives, which is also a crisis in the lives of those to whom they are to minister, I would commend the verses which have just been read, as a subject for frequent remembrance and prayer. They contain what might almost be called a summary of St. Paul's teaching, in which the inseparable connection between faith and conduct, between doctrine and duty, and between the past, the present, and the future, are plainly set before us. There must be a belief in the divine work of redemption in the past, a life of righteousness in the present, and a looking forward to the eternal reward in the future. Faith, charity, and hope are all of them set forth. Two epiphanies, two appearances are spoken of; and they are the two of which our minds should have been full during this Advent season. There is the epiphany of grace, when the Divine Son appeared to bring salvation to all men; and there is the epiphany of glory, when He shall appear to execute judgment upon all men. And between these two there is "the blessed hope."

That is the one note that I would sound in your hearts to-day—hope. Let those who are present to-day to receive office in Christ's Church, and those who are present to testify their belief in the necessity for such officers, if the work of Christ is to be done in His way, take away from this service a consciousness of renewed hope, and therefore of increased strength and of quickened life.

There are those who are constantly telling us that we live in times of peculiar difficulties and peculiar dangers, in times of unblushing vice and uncompromising scepticism, in times of boundless social and political corruption, and of boundless irreligion and unbelief. These things may be true; and there is no earnest Christian who has not at times been perplexed and saddened by them. But, thank God, there are other things which are equally true, and ought to be equally recognised and remembered. If the present is an age of peculiar dangers and boundless irreligion, it is also an age of peculiar encouragements and boundless hope.

There are Christian people who love to look back to some period in the history of the Church, which they have come to regard as a sort of golden age, in which communities of saintly men and women were ministered to by a still more saintly clergy, and in which the Church went beautifully on its way, untroubled by doubts, or dissensions, or heresies, and unstained by worldliness, or apostasy, or sloth. I can only say that, as far as my own study of Church history has been allowed to extend, I have never been able to find this golden age, and that I have ceased to believe in its existence.

We do not find it in the New Testament, either before or after Pentecost.

Not while Christ was still present in the flesh as the Ruler and Instructor of His Church. That period is marked by the ignorance and unbelief of the Apostles, by their quarrels, their ambition for the first places in an earthly kingdom, their intolerant spirit, by the flight of all in the hour of Christ's danger, by the denials of St. Peter, by the treachery and suicide of Judas. And not after Christ had ascended, and the Spirit had been given. Apostles can still be time-serving and still quarrel with one another; and other disciples can still be guilty of the gravest errors in conduct and belief. Witness the monstrous disorders in the Church of Corinth, the fickleness of the Galatian converts, the unchristian asceticism of the Colossian heretics, the studied immorality of those of Ephesus. The Church, presided over by St. Timothy, is the Church of Alexander and Hymenæus and Philetus, who removed the very corner-stone of the Christian faith by denying the Resurrection; and the Churches presided over by St. John contained the Nicolaitans, condemned as hateful to Jesus Christ, and Diotrephes, who repudiated the Apostle and excommunicated those who received his messengers. And there is much more of the same sort to prove to us that the Apostolic age had defects and stains at least as great as those which deface our own.

It would not be difficult, if time allowed, to take each of the periods which have been selected as specially bright and perfect epochs in the history of the Church, and show that in every case, directly we pass through the hazy glow, which the imagination of later writers has thrown around such periods, and get down to solid facts, then, either the brightness and perfection are found to be illusory, or they are counterbalanced by many dark spots and disorders. The ages of faith are the ages of schisms and heresies; the ages of the martyrs are the ages of the lapsed; and the ages of great success are the ages of great corruption. A fair comparison of the period in which our own lot has been cast with any previous period in the history of the Church will never lead to any just feeling of discouragement. I can but speak for myself; but for years the conviction has grown upon me, that at no era since our religion was first founded have the prospects of Christianity been so bright as they are at the present time.

Look at the great contest between the Gospel and heathenism. Was there ever a time when missions were more numerous or better organised, and when missionaries were, as a rule, better instructed, better equipped, or more devoted? And, although a correct estimate passes the skill of man, it may be doubted whether there ever was a time when missions achieved more solid success. Look at the relations between the Churches, into which Christendom is unhappily divided. Was there ever a period at which there was less bitterness, more earnest and wide-spread desire for the restoration of unity? Look again at our own Church; at its abundant machinery for every kind of beneficent object; at the beautiful work which is being done in a quiet and simple way by numbers of Christian men and women in thousands of parishes; at the increase in services, in confirmations, in communions; at the princely offerings of many of the wealthy laity; at the humble offerings—equally princely in God's sight—of many of the poor. Can we point to a time in which party feeling (bad as it still is) was less rancorous, when parishes were better worked, when the clergy were better educated or more self-sacrificing, when the people were more responsive to what is being done for them?

The very possibility of seriously raising such questions as these is in itself a reason for taking courage. And therefore, along with those many solemn and awful thoughts, which must necessarily crowd upon the mind of every serious person, when he responds to the call to enrol himself as a deacon or a priest under the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, do not forget that equally necessary and equally reasonable feeling of hope, which, in a very special way, is the heritage of this generation.

This is the bright heritage into which you are now entering. How are you to cherish it? How to make the most of it? Many things are needed, but I shall mention but two of them. The first has special reference to yourselves; the second to your relations with others.

The first is sincerity. Be sincere, be genuine, be consistent, be real. Sincerity is one element in that "quietness and confidence" wherein lies our strength. The time has, alas! long since gone by when an Englishman's word was as good as his bond: yet even the dishonest Englishman still respects honesty in others. But he has no respect for, very often he has no mercy on, the insincere, the inconsistent clergyman. "I don't hold," he will tell you, "with strictness of life myself, but I like a man to live up to what he professes. He may be right in preaching that this world is all vanity, and that self-sacrifice is the one road to happiness; but his own life does not look as if he believed it."

To talk much about hard work, and be constantly out of the parish; to visit often among the rich, and seldom among the poor; to have plenty of time for lawn-tennis, but not much for the schools; to be a diligent reader of the newspapers, but not of the Greek Testament; to have frequent social engagements, and few week-day services; to have abundance of services, and never to attend them except when it is his turn to officiate;—these are the things which stamp a man as unreal, and hinder him from holding fast and handing on to others the blessed hope that has come down to him.

Secondly, there is need of sympathy. And by that I mean something more than the power of "rejoicing with them that do rejoice, and weeping with them that weep." Be open-minded; be open-hearted. Beware of the spirit of controversy; of that habit of mind which approaches most questions with the conviction that just two views respecting them are possible, one's own and the wrong one; of that straitening of the affections which refuses to give any welcome to those from whom one chances to differ. Let us learn to make the very most that we can of those great truths about which we are agreed; and the very least that we conscientiously can of those important, but certainly minor questions, about which we unhappily cannot agree. Too often, far, far too often, we do the very reverse of this; exaggerate our differences about ritual, while we ignore our common acceptance of Scripture and the Creeds. Thus again we forfeit our power of fostering and augmenting the blessed hope that has been entrusted to us.

Whatever may happen, hold fast that hope; the hope of learning to "live righteously in this world;" the hope of "bringing salvation" to others; the hope of being able with them to rejoice as "a people for Christ's own possession." You will make mistakes, you will be harshly criticised, you may make enemies, may alienate friends. Nevertheless, "look for the blessed hope;" "look for the appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour." And all your perplexities, all your despondencies, all your disappointments will for ever take flight, when you hear those words of Divine welcome—"Well done, good and faithful servant. Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

◆

SARAH, OR SUBJECTION IN MARRIAGE.

A SERMON BY THE REV. CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, M.A., RECTOR OF GLASTON, RUTLAND; FORMERLY FELLOW AND TUTOR OF PETERHOUSE, CAMBRIDGE.

SERMON PREACHED AT GLASTON.

"As Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him Lord: whose daughters ye are as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement."—1 PETER iii. 6.

THERE is no sight more interesting to study than a family living together in peace and holiness, and in godly love one toward another.

Holy Scripture introduces us to several holy families, and, among the first, to that household of faith, the family of faithful Abraham.

Himself, the father of the faithful, his wife Sarah, Isaac the child of promise, Rebekah the faithful daughter-in-law, her nurse Deborah, and Abraham's servant, the elder of his house, apparently the same as Eliezer, who was born in his house, these are characters more or less plainly depicted for us.

It is true that there were others connected with his family. Lot, his nephew, who forsook them, and Hagar, who (I suppose) was one of the maidservants presented to Abraham by Pharaoh in Egypt, and who once fled from her mistress, Sarai, and afterwards was cast out, with her son Ishmael, who had mocked at the child of promise. But looking at this family as a whole, we see how the blessing of God rested upon it. And we see what sort of a family it was which God so abundantly blessed.

First of all, we see the father depending upon God. He obeyed the voice which "called him from Charran, summoned him from Ur." He went out in faith, not knowing whither he went, but knowing this only, that whither the Lord God led him, God helping him, he would go.

Such was Abram, the friend of God, and the father of this family, when his father Terah died. He was to be more than the father of that family: he was to be the head of the household of faith. For a household, if it is to thrive and do well, must have a head.

It sometimes comes about that a woman is prac tically the head of a family. This may be better than that the family should have no head at all; but I do not think that it can be very good for her herself, nor that it is the ideal which Holy Scripture sets before us. It is natural for a man to listen to the counsel of the woman that he loves, almost to the extent of making himself her willing slave and servant. But a good woman will take care that she does not abuse this readiness on the part of the man who loves her. As a man ought to be very careful to find a good, God-fearing woman before he gives his heart away, so ought the woman to be very careful not to desire of him any service or compliance which is not according to the will of God.

I suppose that two of the most beautiful women that have ever been were Eve, who was of one flesh with Adam, which was the Son of God in the time of man's innocency, and Sarah, who retained her comeliness even late in her long life.

But early in the record of the married life of the two we read of both the husbands—Adam, I mean, and Abraham likewise—each hearkening unto the voice of his wife and therein doing amiss, because each of these fair women gave advice distrustful of the good providence of God.

It would have been well for these wives, as well as for themselves, if the men had steeled themselves to make a refusal, and to have taught them that the will of God was better than their own desire, and His thought higher than theirs. We know the effect of Adam's compliance. We read, also, that when Abram had done as Sarai requested him she turned round upon him and blamed him for the consequences. When Hagar despised her, Sarai said to Abram, "My wrong be upon thee; the Lord judge between me and thee."

After the fall, God taught Eve that her desire should be to her husband, and that he should rule over her. And when her first son was born she magnified the Lord, and recognised His grace. Sarah also seems in time thoroughly to have learned the duty of a wife's subjection to her husband, so that she became, by God's grace, an example to faithful women, as truly as her husband Abraham was the father of the faithful.

He may have misdirected her sometimes, but still she would be an obedient and submissive wife. If lawful rulers sometimes direct amiss nothing is so likely to teach them wisdom, as that they should have subjects ready always to obey them loyally and to the letter, in things not contrary to the law of God.

It is only one in ten thousand like Lord Nelson, who, being in a position of subjection, can hope to do right by disregarding a superior's order. For "to obey is better than sacrifice." And there is a moral victory over one's self which is worth more than claiming to have a better judgment than one's superior.

Now with regard to the subjection of the wife to the husband, I think there is much to commend it as a happy condition. First of all it is an honourable condition. For a due order of submission must be one of the chief principles, almost the mainspring of family life. And that is an honourable thing to maintain.

It is quite true that the Incarnation has wrought a wonderful change in the condition of womankind. But it is not true that the Gospel has equalised the sexes in this respect. St. Peter says (I believe), more about the submission of women than even Moses did. St. Paul certainly insisted on it more than all the Old Testament prophets put together.

It may not have been necessary to say much about what was a common practice under the Law. But the fact remains that the Holy Spirit taught the Apostles to speak very plainly and forcibly about it, both to Jews and Gentiles under the Gospel. Submission is an honourable condition, for Christ, who gave dignity to the female sex, by His birth of a pure Virgin, gave also dignity to the state of submission, in that "He learned obedience," and in that "He went down" with His mother, "with Joseph," "and was subject—was submitting Himself unto them."

Now, why did Christ submit Himself as a child to St. Mary and St. Joseph? Surely to teach Christian children to submit themselves to all that are set over them in the Lord.

And is not this one of the glorious dignities of a wife's submission that she is admitted to teach practically, and by example, this same lesson which her Saviour taught?

It may be said a Christian woman does not require to learn submission. I am not sure of that. I am sure, at least, that Christian men, because Christ has set them free, need all the more carefully to practise submission, not to their wives indeed, but to the laws of the Church, and of the Realm, and to the sovereign power of the State, because they are part of God's holy ordinance. And the higher a man is in the social scale, the more careful ought he to be to set a good example in this respect.

So it is with a Christian wife. She may not need the restraint of submission for the perfecting of her character, though, for my part, I believe the best women that I know have gained much of their sweetness by so schooling themselves according to the ordinance of Almighty God which He gave, not by the transient law on Sinai, but by the universal law in Paradise. But you may be sure of this, if she is to teach children to be good men and women; if she is to train servants to be useful in a household—and remember that they have no business to go into service if they have no wish to be useful members to and of the family—if she is herself to contribute, as she so greatly can to make the family dwell together in unity, and to, be of one mind in the house, she cannot do better than by letting children and servants see in her a constant example of loving submission to the father of the family, and to the master to whom they are to be subject while they are inmates of his house.

Sarah was not ashamed to call Abraham her lord while she was speaking to the angels. It was, as St. Peter says, a common manner of speech with her which she used without being ashamed of it, as the best servants are never ashamed of the words "master" and "mistress." It simply reminded herself and others of what she had made—by her conduct, a simple ruling fact in her life, that she was obedient to her own husband in everything as unto the Lord.

It is true that in Christ Jesus there is no difference between male and female, that is to say, there is no distinction of privilege as to eternal life, no priority as to holiness.

But it does not mean that there is no more any distinction between the sexes, as to their stations and duties in the family. The Epistles show clearly that no such change from the old condition of things was contemplated. The husband has his responsibilities and duties. The wife also has her duties and responsibilities. Man and wife are on an equality, so far as the fact goes of each having duties and responsibilities; but the duties are not the same so much as reciprocal. They form the two different corresponding parts of the family bond, and together make one whole. Two parts of a whole may be equal in value without being equal in position.

You may divide a loaf, for instance, into two parts, so that there is no difference between the parts in their essential goodness, at least it need be a matter in which opinion might differ which was best, but still the one may be the upper and one the lower portion, and all would agree which was which.

If husband and wife were to be equal, or rather I should say undistinguishable, in respect to their mutual relations, there would be no such relationship left as husband and wife. There would be instead in a family, either practically two husbands or two wives, or else—and this the most likely result—two in a condition which was neither one thing nor the other.

A true wife shares her husband's joys and sorrows all the more perfectly, because when there is a burden to be borne she does not try to lay hold of the weight in exactly the same point as he does, or stand in the exact place which is his by right from which to contemplate the joy. She bears her own part and stands in her own place and so helps him best.

This is no indignity to woman, that she should have to win her crown of glory in a condition of submission.

An English Sovereign's son, the Prince of Wales, thought it no indignity to wear as his distinctive badge the motto which means "I serve." It is the glory of Christ's ministers that they can say to the people, we are "ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake."

It is written of Christ Himself that God the Father "highly exalted Him," because He "learned obedience." Therefore, let none say that a place of submission and obedience is a degrading or degraded state.

A famous schoolmaster of a great school once claimed to be the greatest man in England, because (as he said) the women governed the men of England, and the boys governed their mothers, and he governed the boys.

I do not know whether the state of affairs, of which he spoke, was quite the most satisfactory that might be imagined; but if we put the word influenced instead of "governed," we shall not hesitate to say that a woman's influence is very great; and, further, that a wise mother will not only influence her husband for good, without trying to rule him, but she will also by her loving behaviour govern her sons, at least as effectually as the most imperious schoolmaster. She will exert this influence most effectively and most naturally—that is to say, most in accordance with the way and will of God—by being careful to follow the Apostle's rules: "Wives, subject yourselves unto your own husbands as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the Church, being Himself the Saviour of the body. But as the Church is subject to Christ, so let the wives also be to their husbands in everything. Husbands love your wives, even as Christ who loved the Church, and gave Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the laver of water with the word."

Ye wives be in subjection to your own husbands, that even if any obey not the word, they may, without the word, be gained by the behaviour of their wives, beholding your chaste behaviour, coupled with fear. Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of plaiting the hair and of wearing jewels and gold or of putting on apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. For after this manner aforetime the holy women also, who hoped in God adorned themselves, being in subjection to their own husbands: as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose children ye now are, if ye do well, and are not put in fear by any terror.

Ye husbands, in like manner, dwell with your wives according to knowledge, giving honour unto the woman as unto the weaker vessel, as being also joint heirs of the grace of life; to the end that your prayers be not hindered.

You find in your English Bible the words, "Be not ye the servants of men." These words were addressed in days when slavery was prevalent to such as were not born in slavery themselves, and they conveyed a wise counsel to such people not to become bond-slaves by selling or giving their persons into slavery, such as now has been for many years abolished by English law. The precept itself is out of date. But the eternal Christian principle lying at the bottom of that obsolete precept illustrates, so far as marriage is concerned, the meaning of the last words which conclude the address printed at the end of our Church Service of Holy Matrimony—"So long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement."

"Be not ye the servants of men" does not mean that there are to be no Christian servants, but only that no one was of his own accord to bind himself or herself over, body and soul, to a slave-master. "Become not bond-servants of men." In the first instance those words cannot refer to Christian marriage at all. They could, at the most, only suggest the advice that a free woman should avoid becoming the wife of a man who would treat her as a bond-slave, not as a fellow-heir of the grace of life with himself. But the precept about not becoming bond-servants would not even apply to any who had unfortunately found themselves placed in such a slavish position owing to their misfortune or their carelessness, for it refers to those whose choice is still free. When once a slave ran away from his master to St. Paul and became a Christian, the Apostle of Christ sent him back to his master, only desiring that he might be received with Christian kindness.

But the "not being put in fear by any terror" or "amazement" does apply directly to the marriage state.

It was a favourite saying with the mother of a family of daughters that a lady is never idle, and is never in a hurry. I am sure that it is the case in all classes of life that a true wife is never in a slavish fear of her husband, the nearer she approaches to that perfect love which casteth out at once both fear and torment. Holy matrimony never made her a bond-servant: she will not become one if she desires to help her husband. Women cannot always help being timid, but they can help being in a servile terror even of the most savage husband, for women have powers at command which are more invincible than force.

The next best thing to not being afraid is not to show that you are afraid. It was a wise saying that you should "assume a virtue if you have it not." If you show your husband that you have a slavish terror, true Christian obedience or loving submission on your part, and the prospect, or the renewal, or the preservation of loving regard on his part will be like to be at an end.

If there is anything amiss; if through folly or misfortune you have had losses; if even you had run into debt, it is far better that he should be angry for a while—perhaps you have deserved it—than that he should find out too late that he has not your confidence; that what is known to neighbours, perhaps, and tradesmen, has been kept secret from him; that you have gone to others for help and sympathy, and not to him. Better by far confess your faults to him without delay and throw yourself upon his mercy, than keep a secret which is a barrier to unfeigned love.

Remember, also, that Sarah is set before you as an example of doing well.

She was like the virtuous woman described in the last chapter of the Book of Proverbs, concerning whom the Jewish women have a reading every Sabbath-day: "The heart of her husband trusted in her, and [by her] he had no lack of gain. She did him good, and not evil, all the days of her life. . . . Strength and dignity were her clothing; and [by her wise providence] she laughed at the time to come. She opened her mouth with wisdom; and the law of kindness was on her tongue. She looked well to the ways of her household, and ate not the bread of idleness.

"Her child rose up and called her blessed; her husband also, and he promised her, saying, 'Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all. Favour is deceitful, and beauty is vain; but a woman that feareth the Lord she shall be praised.'"

◆

THE *Northampton Herald* says that, owing to their greatly reduced income through the agricultural depression, the Dean and Chapter of Peterborough decided last week to reduce the salaries of officials 5 per cent.

WE regret to learn that the Bishop of St. Albans was unable to preside at his ordination on St. Thomas's Day, and is now confined to his house through illness. He is suffering from weakness resulting from over-work, and is ordered complete rest for the present.

THE Worcester High School for Girls, which is a lasting memorial of the work of the Dean of Lincoln in that city, on Monday last added one more to the list of Jubilee commemorations by the opening of an organ in the large hall. An address was delivered on the occasion by Canon Creighton.

CANON SCOTT, of St. John's, Leeds, Commissary of Bishop Scott, of North China, requests the Bishop's correspondents to address "Cheefoo," instead of Peking, after the 1st of January, and not to write at all after the 1st of February, as the right rev. prelate will leave China at the end of March to be present at the Lambeth Conference.

THE clergy of the archdeaconry of St. David's, at meeting lately held at Haverfordwest, adopted the following resolutions:—"That this meeting is favourable to the Tithe Bill of last session, as far as it makes the tithe rent-charge a real charge on the landowner, and practically recoverable from him by the titheowner." "That this meeting further respectfully urges on her Majesty's Government the importance of passing a measure embodying a scheme for the redemption of tithe on just terms."

RUPTURE CURED!
IMPORTANT INVENTION.
MR. C. B. HARNESS, the renowned Inventor of Electropathic Belts and other Curative Electrical Appliances, has lately introduced a **new Washable, Everlasting** Truss, known as
HARNESS' XYLONITE TRUSS
A NEW TRUSS.
Guaranteed to **last a lifetime.** All who suffer from **Rupture** should wear **Harness' Xylonite TRUSS.** It has a beautifully smooth flesh-coloured surface, of a washable and durable material; gives complete comfort and support without irritation; is cheap; and weighs only a few ounces.
Pamphlet and Advice FREE OF CHARGE on application to **Medical Battery Co. Ld.**
52, OXFORD STREET, LONDON, W.
Corner of Rathbone Place

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1887.

THE EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

EDUCATION has doubtless been a potent cause of the mental differences between men and women. In all ages of the world the education of the female, using the term in its widest sense, has differed widely from that of the male. To her, as her name woman, *i.e.*, weaving man, implies, has always been assigned the task of minding the house, and of providing clothing for the family. "She seeketh wool and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands. She layeth her hands to the distaff, and her hands hold the spindle." For many centuries the end and aim of woman's education has been this of domestic usefulness; as a class she has had no general education or mental training. When she attempted to escape from this ideal she became a victim to the no less narrowing and deleterious one of ornamentalism. Thus Sidney Smith, writing in 1810, remarks: "A century ago the prevailing taste in female education was for housewifery; now it is for accomplishments. The object now is to make women artists—to give them excellence in drawing, music, and dancing." This to a large extent is still the prevailing taste, the object of female education in the middle and upper classes is not that of mental training, but rather of mental decoration. It was not until 1850 that Queen's College and Bedford College were established in London to promote the higher education of women. Twenty years later there followed Girton and Newnham at Cambridge; later still Lady Margaret and Somerville at Oxford, the foundation of the Girls' Public Day Schools Company, the opening of Degrees to women at the University of London, and of the honour examinations at Cambridge and Oxford. Although this advance in female education would seem to demonstrate the theoretical equality of the sexes, their natural inequality continues, and ever will continue to assert itself. It is on this account chiefly that the education of women continues to be widely different from that of men. This difference is not merely in the direction of laying greater stress on mental embellishment; it tends also to protect the female mind from all striving and struggling influences, which constitute the practical schooling of the male intellect. Its *raison d'être* appears to us to consist in the fact that while man is free to select his own occupation or profession, woman's has been fixed and prescribed for her by nature. In order to fulfil her most important duties, and practise her pre-ordained profession with success, woman requires mental training and scientific knowledge to the same degree as man does to practise his profession, whatever it may be. It is the duty of the clergy, and of all other teachers, to remove all impediments and sentimental disabilities to her obtaining them.

Fears are entertained by not a few persons of great judgment and experience in education that the higher culture of women may destroy all the sweet and noble qualities which are characteristic of womanhood. These fears are groundless, because no amount of education can obliterate the ordinances of God and nature which have formed woman to be the complement, not the rival, of man. But ignorance is not one of the distinctively feminine qualities, therefore learning can never deteriorate those qualities. On the contrary, it can only tend to refine and beautify them. It will make her a better helpmeet for her husband, and a better guide and inspirer of the minds of her children. Eighty years since Sidney Smith wrote that "the (higher) education of women favours public morals; it provides for every season of life, and leaves a woman when she is stricken by the hand of time, not as she now is, destitute of everything and neglected by all, but with the full power and the splendid attractions of knowledge—diffusing the elegance of polite literature, and receiving the homage of learned and accomplished men." Since this was penned the experiment of educating women to attend to dignified and important subjects has been tried, and according to the evidence of experienced ladies, as well as gentlemen, the apprehension that such higher education would deteriorate the highest and best qualities of womanhood has proved groundless. The same conclusion might have been arrived at by any physiologist or naturalist who understood the natural and fundamental faculties and instincts distinctive of sex.

> Naturam expellas furcâ tamen usque recurrit.

Next week we propose to examine the important argument that this higher edcation is injurious to health and shortens the life of women.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

PARTIES IN THE REVISION SYNOD.

SIR,—Mr. Joseph J. Murphy mistakes me. I did not say that there was a friendly alliance between the Broad and Low Parties, for the banishment of the Athanasian Creed, and the expurgation of the Baptismal Services. All I said was that the Parties helped one another. As, according to Mr. Murphy, the Broad Party was so few, the Athanasian Creed could not have been got rid of at all without the help of the Low Party. As to the plan for an alternative Baptismal Service, Dean, now Bishop, Reichel proposed it, and he surely was one of the Broad Party. That the two Parties voted together on both questions, the divisions prove. They are still existing, and I have them before me.

EVEN-HANDED JUSTICE.

P.S.—As to the honesty of the contracting parties, I say nought. Though how the Low Party could give up the Incarnation, or the Broad pretend to think that regeneration in our Services means conversion, passes, in my mind, the powers of charity to conceive.

◆

THE WORDS OF ADMINISTRATION—WHAT DO THEY MEAN?

SIR,—I believe these words are commonly misunderstood. Allow me to explain. The words are, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve," etc. Some think that the prayer is, "that our Lord on the Cross may preserve us." But whether it mean His Body slain, or His Body glorified, or the merits of His death, that is impossible. What is to preserve us is, not what was offered on Calvary, It is, of course, the merit of that which has gained us all. But it is the grace of God that is to preserve us. So says Doddridge's hymn, "Grace, 'tis a charming sound." "'Twas grace that kept me to this day, and will not let me go." To this agrees the collect for 6th Sunday after Trinity: "Keep us in the same, through Jesus Christ our Lord." And the prayer in the Confirmation Service, "Defend, O Lord, this thy child with thy heavenly grace," etc. This grace accompanies the bread, so that our Lord calls the bread His Body. As St. Paul says, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion"—communion eating, and dividing among yourselves—"of the Body of Christ?" The meaning of the words of administration is, "May this bread, which, clothed with grace, our Lord calls His Body—may it, thus accompanied, preserve," etc. These words, in Edward's 1st Book, were taken from the Sarum and other forms. The same meaning is preserved, only that instead of referring to a corporal presence, as in the old forms, it is now applied to the grace, which accompanies the bread. In the old forms, "the Body preserve," etc., meant, "may what I now give preserve thee." The same words meant the same in Edward's 1st Book. It was because this was their meaning that they were put out of the 2nd Book. It must be with the same meaning that they were restored under Elizabeth, and that we still have them. If our Lord death preserve and sanctify us, then the Holy Ghost is no longer the Sanctifier. He becomes a mere name —*nominis umbra*. That the words referred to what is *then* given, and not to our Lord on the Cross, is plain, in that they were put out of Edward's 2nd Book, which they could not have been if they were meant to refer to the one oblation on the Cross. They were put out because they were thought to favour a corporal presence. But they were brought in again, because they taught only a spiritual presence, which their omission seemed to deny. If the words were put into the 1st Book of Edward, as referring to the bread given and put out of the 2nd for the same reason, it is plain that that must be their true meaning. The Foreign reformers, who were consulted, objected to them, on account of their Popish sound as referring to what the clergyman gives.

C. C., V.-G.

◆

LINES TO CHRIST CHURCH CATHEDRAL, DUBLIN.

HAIL! honoured pile, historic fane,
Dole-tribute of the ruthless Dane:
Built, while a qualm of conscience quelled
The fiery soul of him* who held
By sword the city won by crime,—
Eblana † of the olden time.
Built, in an age when civil broil
Was valour deemed and noblest toil;
When strife-torn tribes, and loose-held lands,
Grown weak and waste by war and sloth.
Allured adventurous Norman bands
To curb by law and tenure both,
The war of soil, and tribal feud;
When private clash, and customs rude,
And ill respect for native laws,
Long barred the Island's common cause.
Built, that the sceptre of the Prince
Of Peace might rule men, and convince
Them strife and blood are 'neath His ban
Who preached the brotherhood of man.

When undefiled from Calvary's Mount
The Life-well overflowed its fount,
And freshened, as it flowed, with grace
The sin-parched lands of Adam's race;—
E'en then for prayer and praise to Christ,
Within thy crypt‡ His saints kept tryst;—
Ere sainted Succoth § turned to God
The land in youth a slave he trod.
Oh! dimmed thy shrine in later time,
When Folly draped the Truth sublime,
And men, by sacerdotal craft,
Professed the soul to shrive, and waft
To bliss or bale: when Holy Creed
Subserved to love of power and greed,
And dying knight, or burge, was made,
From spoils of war, and toils of trade,
Enrich a fane with fee or farm,
To fend off Heaven's avenging arm.
Thus, gear for guilt they fondly thought
The soul's eternal surety wrought.

Stone-coffined in thine aisles repose
The forerank of their race who rose

---

* Sitric, King of the Danes of Dublin.

† Eblana, the ancient name of Dublin.

‡ Christian worship was held in the crypt of Christ Church Cathedral long before St. Patrick's arrival in Ireland.

§ Succoth, the original name of St. Patrick.

High in their generation's day
To combat, counsel, teach, and sway.
The Dubh-Ghall Dane, and Fin-Ghall Norse,
The Norman, Celt, and Saxon corse—
Or be their souls unblest or blest,
Their dust commingles here in rest
Of death, who restless were in life
For conquest : for their trade was strife.
The prelate in his robes arrayed,
With the crusader-warrior laid :—
The saint who lived on earth for heaven,
The wight whose ways to ill were given :—
And statesmen deep, and legal sages,
Whose toils engrail our history's pages :—
And landed lord, and dowered dame,
And moneyed cit,—all here but claim
For all their pomp, their wealth, and graces,
The clod of clay each dust displaces,
All wait alike the fateful call
To Judgment-tide. They, nude of all
This world holds sweet, must bear that Day
The errless test of Christ's assay.

Charles Richard Panter, M.A., LL.D.,
Author of "Orpheus and Eurydice, and other Poems," etc., etc. (second edition).

* * *

On Friday, the 24th inst., at a meeting of the Bristol Bishopric Committee, Sir G. W. Edwards in the chair, a letter was read from the Bishop, who said :—"Being deeply interested in a moderate increase of the Episcopate, and doing what I can to bring it about, I cannot forbear saying that I should feel it to be a grave discouragement if, here in Bristol, where an Act has been secured for a Bishopric, such a sum as that which I have named were to be allowed, from apathy, to lapse." It was agreed unanimously that an appeal for further subscriptions, amounting to £6,000, should be issued without delay. This would raise the subscribed fuud to £30,000. The anonymous offer of £10,000 was made conditional on £30,000 being subscribed before next Midsummer. And this condition; it was stated, would not be relaxed. The Bishop encouraged the committee to hope that, if £40,000 was obtained, the rest of the required endowment would be forthcoming from other sources. The circular appeal was drafted, and it was agreed that with the circular should be enclosed a copy of "The Bristol Bishopric Act."

* * *

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adams, Rev. J., Rector of Postwick, near Norwich.

Bullock-Webster, Rev. G. R., Chaplain of Ely Theological College ; Resident Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely.

Burney, Rev. Edward M., Vicar of St. Mary's, Edmonton.

Chapman, Rev. Edward Williams, M.A., Honorary Canon in Carlisle Cathedral.

Crosse, Rev. T. G., Rector of St. Alphege's ; Master of East Bridge Hospital, Canterbury.

Drewe, Rev. George Henry, Vicar of Shilton, Oxon.

Dunbar, Rev. John, Minister of St. Mark's, Leeds Road, Huddersfield.

Field, Rev. Sydney Benjamin, Vicar of Woodbridge, Suffolk.

Garlick, Rev. Ambrose, M.A., Master of Donington Grammar School ; General Preacher in the Diocese of Lincoln.

Gepp, Rev. Nicholas Parker, Vicar of Witchingham ; Diocesan Inspector of Schools within the Deanery of Sparham.

Giles, Rev. W. Theophilus, Chaplain to the Chester County Lunatic Asylum.

Hanbury, Rev. the Hon. A., Rector of Shobdon, Herefordshire ; Rural Dean of Leominster.

Heap, Rev. William Henry, Vicar of Brothertoft, Lincolnshire.

Henning, Rev. Charles, Vicar of St. Mary's, Middleton, Leeds.

Jenkins, Rev. David, Vicar of Llanycwrn ; Vicar of Llangwyryfin, Cardiganshire.

Johnson, Rev. Henry Barham, Rector of Welborne ; Diocesan Inspector of Schools within the Deanery of Hingham.

Lauria, Rev. John Alexander, B.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Ainsworth, Bolton.

Lukin, Rev. James, Rector of Wickford ; Rector of Hinton Martel, Wimborne.

Mills, Rev. W. H., M.A., Rector of Siddington, Gloucestershire.

Mirams, Rev. T., Curate of St. David's, Birmingham ; Chaplain of the Birmingham Workhouse.

Newbolt, Rev. W. C. E., Vicar of Malvern Link ; Principal of Ely Theological College.

Norcock, Rev. Edward Henry George, M.A., Vicar of Walshamle-Willows ; Vicar of Sapiston, Suffolk.

Pearse, Rev. John Thomas, Rector of Brabourne, Kent ; Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Preston, Rev. Roger Kerrison, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Congleton.

Rowsell, Rev. John, Vicar of Beccles ; Rural Dean of South Elmham and Wangford.

Sandford, Prebendary E. G , Vicar of Cornwood ; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter.

Sinnett, Rev. William Hughes, M A., late Vicar of Kidwelly ; Rector of Llangunider, Brecon.

Smith, Rev. Canon James Allan, M.A , Vicar of St. Mary's, Swansea ; to the Consolidated Chapelry of St. Matthew's, Swansea, also, by dispensation.

Steavenson, Rev. F. R., M.A., Rector of Quenington, Gloucestershire.

Stonex, Rev. Francis T., M.A , late Curate-in-Charge of St. Michael's Mission District, Claughton, Cheshire ; Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Birkenhead.

Truman, Rev. J. Morley, Rector of Hinton Martel, Wimborne, Dorsetshire ; Rector of Wickford, Essex.

Wanstall, Rev. R. Cotterill, Vicar of Dawley Magna, Shropshire, and Rural Dean of Shifnal ; Vicar of Condover, near Shrewsbury.

Watkins, Rev. Walter J., Minister of St. Cuthbert's, West Hampstead.

Welsh, Rev. Arthur, Vicar of Harewood.

Westall, Rev. Henry, Perpetual Curate of St. Cuthbert's, Earl's Court, Kensington.

Whitaker, Rev. John, Vicar of Cononley, Leeds.

Whitfield, Rev. Charles N., Minister of St. James's, Gunnersbury.

Wilkinson, Rev. John Frome, M.A., Rector of Kilvington, Nottinghamshire.

Winter, Rev. Seneca William, Vicar of Sodington.

* * *

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Drake, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Mountsorrel, Loughborough, on the 22nd inst., aged 71.

Lowe, Rev. Thomas, M.A , Hon. Canon of Chichester, and for thirty-seven years Vicar of Willingdon, on the 19th inst., aged 68.

Pincott, Rev. Edward London, at Bolam Vicarage, Newcastle-on-Tyne, on the 23rd inst., aged 50.

Robertson, Rev. John, LL.D., late of 123, Adelaide Road, at St. John's Parsonage, Tailors' Benevolent Institution, Haverstock Hill, on the 23rd inst., aged 61.

Woodford, Rev. Adolphus Frederick Alexander, eldest son of the late Field-Marshal Sir A. Woodford, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., on the 23rd inst., aged 66.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 028229273